

Robert B. Pippin

HEGEL'S

REALM OF SHADOWS

Logic as Metaphysics
in *The Science of Logic*



Hegel's Realm of Shadows

Hegel's Realm of Shadows

LOGIC AS METAPHYSICS IN
THE SCIENCE OF LOGIC

Robert B. Pippin

The University of Chicago Press
Chicago and London

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 60637

The University of Chicago Press, Ltd., London

© 2019 by The University of Chicago

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission, except in the case of brief quotations in critical articles and reviews. For more information, contact the University of Chicago Press, 1427 E. 60th St., Chicago, IL 60637.

Published 2019

Printed in the United States of America

28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 19 1 2 3 4 5

ISBN-13: 978-0-226-58870-4 (cloth)

ISBN-13: 978-0-226-58884-1 (e-book)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226588841.001.0001>

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Pippin, Robert B., 1948– author.

Title: Hegel's realm of shadows : logic as metaphysics in the Science of logic / Robert B. Pippin.

Description: Chicago ; London : The University of Chicago Press, 2018. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2018014784 | ISBN 9780226588704 (cloth : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780226588841 (e-book)

Subjects: LCSH: Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, 1770–1831. Wissenschaft der Logik. | Logic. | Philosophy, German.

Classification: LCC B2942.Z7 P545 2018 | DDC 193—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2018014784>

© This paper meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48–1992 (Permanence of Paper).

CONTENTS

| | |
|-----------------|-----|
| Acknowledgments | vii |
|-----------------|-----|

PART I

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| 1 | The Significance of <i>The Science of Logic</i> | 3 |
| 2 | Logic and Metaphysics | 39 |
| 3 | The Role of Self-Consciousness in <i>The Science of Logic</i> | 101 |
| 4 | Logic and Negation | 139 |

PART II

| | | |
|---|--|-----|
| 5 | The Logic of Being: The “Given” as a Logical Problem | 183 |
| 6 | Essence as Reflected Being | 217 |
| 7 | The Lives of Concepts | 251 |
| 8 | Life as a Logical Concept | 273 |
| 9 | The True and the Good | 299 |

| | |
|----------------|-----|
| Reference List | 323 |
| Index | 333 |

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I owe a very great debt to the Friedrich von Siemens Foundation of Munich, and to its director, Heinrich Meier, for a generous fellowship that allowed me to spend the year in Munich in 2012–13. I had begun a book on the *Logic* two years before, and this fellowship allowed me an invaluable opportunity to begin the writing of several chapters and to intensify my reading of the literature on Hegel's most important book. I am especially indebted personally to Heinrich and Wiebke Meier for many acts of kindness and generosity to me and my wife during our stay there.

I am also grateful to many conference and colloquium audiences over the past eight years for patiently helping me work my way through several early versions of chapters, and for several years of dedicated graduate students in a series of seminars about the *Encyclopedia Logic* and *The Science of Logic*. Earlier, in some cases much earlier, and very different or truncated versions of chapters have appeared elsewhere, and I am grateful to editors either for permission to retain copyright for publication of the versions in this book or for permission to reprint here passages of, specifically, *The Oxford Handbook of Hegel*, ed. D. Moyer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017); *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, vol. 114, part 2, 2014; a German version of part of chapter 4, "Die Logik der Negation bei Hegel," in *200 Jahre Hegels Wissenschaft der Logik*, ed. C. Wirsing, A. Koch, F. Schick, and K. Vieweg (Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 2014); a version of chapter 6 appeared in *Schelling Studien*, vol. 1, 2013; and a version of chapter 7 is collected in *Kant on Persons and Agency*, ed. Eric Watkins (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).

The cover photo is of Anthony Caro's great piece, *Sculpture Two*. I take it to be a visual way of making the Hegelian point that an abstraction can be concrete, even weighty, and that what appears to be a contingent assemblage of parts can be a dynamic, organic unity, no aspect of which can be subtracted, to which nothing can be added. I am most grateful to Barford Sculptures in London for permission to reprint the photograph, and to Michael Fried for many discussions about Caro's sculptures.

Finally, I am grateful yet again to my friend Terry Pinkard for invaluable and detailed comments on the penultimate draft of the book. The anonymous readers for the University of Chicago Press were also generous and very helpful.

PART I

1

INTRODUCTION: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF *THE SCIENCE OF LOGIC*

Reason has insight only into what it itself produces according to
its own design. (*Critique of Pure Reason* Bxiii)

Critical philosophy did indeed already turn *metaphysics* into *logic*
but, like the subsequent idealism, it gave to the logical determina-
tions an essentially subjective significance out of fear of the object.
(*SL* 21.35)

Logic and Idealism

Hegel repeatedly said that the core of his philosophy, what everything else depends on,¹ is to be found in a two-volume, three-part book that he wrote while teaching classical Gymnasium students in Nürnberg between 1812 and 1816, at times teaching versions of the book itself to the no doubt bewildered high-schoolers.² It was called *The Science of Logic*. The first volume is called

1. Even such a simple statement raises immediately a very difficult question that can be properly addressed only at the end of this study. What could Hegel mean by such “dependence”? In just what sense is the *Science of Logic* the “basis” for his Philosophy of Nature and Philosophy of Spirit, his whole “Realphilosophie”? What is the relation of this systematic organization to what Kant says was the structure of ancient philosophy: logic, physics, ethics? What, for that matter, is the relation to Kant’s understanding of this triad? I discuss these issues in chapter 9.

2. The first paragraph of the *Philosophy of Right* is typical of the claim made for the centrality of the *Logic*. There is also an interesting historical story to Hegel’s coming to this position, how he abandoned his view that “logic” was merely an introduction to metaphysics (introducing it

an “objective logic,” and it contains a “logic of being” and a “logic of essence.” The third part, the second volume, is called the “Subjective Logic” and it consists of a “logic of the concept.” To understate the matter in the extreme: this book still awaits its full contemporary reception. Aside from occasional dust-ups about its beginning argument or its “movement,” several invaluable studies of particular topics like negation, reflection, ontology, and the nature of concepts, and occasional attempts at an overview or summary formulations of its purpose, it has not inspired the kind of engagement found in work on Kant’s *Critiques* or Hegel’s own *Phenomenology of Spirit* or *Philosophy of Right*. This is so even though there are a number of other examples of philosophical reflection on logic that form something like a context within which Hegel’s project ought to be comprehensible as an alternative. I mean not just Kant’s transcendental logic, but Fichte’s *Wissenschaftslehre*, Frege’s *Begriffsschrift*, Wittgenstein’s *Tractatus*, and Husserl’s *Logical Investigations*.³

Hegel also says frequently that a science of logic is a “science of pure thinking.” This must be understood in the context of what we designate as “German Idealism.” This idealism, at least the thread that travels from Kant through Fichte to Hegel (Schelling’s “idealism” is another issue), has three components. The first is the claim that a priori knowledge of the world, the

by itself failing to be reflexively adequate), and came to view logic as what is “now” metaphysics. That is, until the last two years of the Jena period, Hegel’s focus was on a demonstration of the insufficiency of logic, or on pure thought as such, all as a kind of practical motivation for the turn to a speculative metaphysics.

From 1806 on, though, Hegel refers to logic as metaphysics, and our question is what that meant for him. Jaeschke’s (2010) phrase is apt, that what happened was the “Absorption der Metaphysik durch die Logik” (223). The historical story is told very well by Harris’s two-volume work (Harris 1972 and 1983) and by Jaeschke (2010), and it is summarized in Di Giovanni’s introduction to *SL* (xi–lxxiv). Cf. Düsing’s (2011) summary, especially 101, on Hegel’s abandonment of reliance on both intellectual intuition and finite reflection for a “speculative unity” that “can be developed out of the oppositions of finite determinations in one and the same line of argument.” Also indispensable on the issue, the articles by Horstmann (1972, 1977). The position I am most sympathetic to is Theunissen’s (1980). The claim (which I also defended in Pippin 1989) is that Hegel opposes the modern *dogmatic* metaphysics that Kant opposed as well: rational psychology, cosmology, and natural theology. But that Hegel does so by an exposition of the “logic” of these projects that is also a critique (what he calls “the objective logic”), all of which culminates in a positive metaphysics of an unprecedented sort, the subjective logic, in which we see how metaphysics is “now” to be understood as “logic.”

3. As Dieter Henrich has pointed out, there were attempts to do what Hegel tried to do better, or in a different way. There were, that is, many attempts at a philosophically significant “logic.” See Henrich 1971, and his treatment of A. Trendelenberg, E. v. Hartmann, K. Werder, H. Ulrici, and K. Fischer, 76–82, especially 82–83n6.

ordinary spatio-temporal world, is possible—knowledge about that world, but achieved independently of empirical experience.⁴ That the *Logic* is a work of a priori philosophy is hardly controversial, even though Hegel understands the relation between pure thinking and thinking informed by what is other than thinking in a way that is uniquely his, as will be discussed in chapter 9. Idealism in this sense is primarily a critique of empiricism (not of empirical knowledge, although it is sometimes confused with such a critique; empiricism is itself an a priori position, intended to explicate what any possible knowing amounts to). The second component is where all the interpretive controversies begin. It is the claim that this a priori knowledge, while, in some sense to be specified, about the world, consists in thinking's or reason's *knowledge of itself*, thinking's determination of thinking, or, as Hegel designates, a "science of pure thinking." (Kant's allegiance to this principle is manifest in the beginning quotation above.) This is the heart of Hegel's claim that his speculative logic is a "metaphysics" in a new sense. It is understandable, but also quite false, to think that these two components can be jointly claimed only if objects of knowledge depend for their existence on being thought, or if access to objects requires some sort of mind-imposed unification of sensory elements, resulting in a "subject-mediated" product, not the thing as it is in itself. There are certainly versions of this existential dependence or subject-mediated interpretation of German Idealism, especially Kant, in the extant literature. This view no doubt stems from the understandable but hasty inference that if such a conceptual structure is not derived from experience, it must be contributed by, or "imposed by," us. This must be so, if objects depend for their experientiability on such "mind-imposed" unity. A variation on this notion of restricted knowledge is the claim that philosophy can determine only the *finitely* knowable aspects of the in principle

4. Hegel does not often explicitly invoke the Kantian terminology of a priori and posteriori, but his insistence on pure thinking, together with his rejection of empiricism in the introduction to the *Encyclopedia Logic*, shows that he means "pure" in the sense of empirically unaided, as well as "presuppositionless." Moreover he is not shy in his praise of Kant for correctly formulating the problem of pure thinking as the problem of synthetic a priori judgments.

Kant's concept of synthetic *a priori* judgments—the concept of *terms that are distinct* and yet *equally inseparable*; of an *identity* which is within it an *inseparable difference*—belongs to what is great and imperishable in his philosophy.

He goes on to say something radical that was the main interest in my 1989 book. "To be sure, this concept is also equally present in intuition, for it is the concept as such and everything is the concept implicitly" (21.200).

knowable, requiring us to admit that we do not know objects as they fully are in themselves. And an even more extreme idealism would hold that the mind (or the divine mind active in us) creates its own objects by thinking them, which certainly explains how pure thinking could on its own determine the nature of the real. But it does so at the price of great implausibility.

But there is clearly a question to be answered, and such an answer would be the third component of idealism: *how* could the first two components possibly be true, if the standard versions of the third component are not true too. One interpretation of Hegel on this point is that these two claims can be jointly assertable only if what there “really” is, the “really real world,” what is accessible only to pure reason alone, is itself *thought*, “thinking moments”—something like the Absolute’s or God’s thinking itself, an inherent, evolving noetic structure. This is sometimes what scholars are insisting on when they insist, against what they perceive as “nonmetaphysical” readings, that Hegel was certainly (and for many quite obviously) a “metaphysician” in just this sense. The nature of the real is an intellectual entity.⁵ The thesis of this book is that these do not exhaust the relevant alternatives, that Hegel most certainly was a “metaphysician,” but that he did not live in this Neoplatonic neighborhood or in the mind-imposed-unity or mind-making-reality camps. That is, the following will attempt an answer to the third dimension of idealism, how the first two elements could jointly be true. The most important watchword for Hegel’s *Logic*, once we realize that no form of “object *dependence* on subject” is at stake in that project (an extremely widespread view of what idealism must be to count as idealism),⁶ is that we are talking not about any dependence but about an “*identity*” (a “speculative identity” to be sure) between the forms of pure thinking and the forms of being. It will take a while to exfoliate the terms of such an identity claim.

I note immediately that there is a widespread view that this Hegelian project (in any possible interpretation of it) is doomed from the start, that there is not and cannot be such a topic as “pure thinking.” Since the Jena romantics and Hegel’s contemporary, Schelling, began this line of attack, it keeps reappearing in the European tradition down to the present, with the popularity of “new realisms” and speculative materialisms and the influence

5. This would not yet by itself establish how we might know a priori anything about such a structure, but the position prepares us for the claim that thought thinking itself is the real, realized as such in our pure thinking, that “cosmic spirit” comes to self-consciousness about itself in the *SL*.

6. See, for example, Larmore 2017.

of cognitive and neuroscience. The criticism is that thinking must always be understood as grounded on, or dependent on, or an epiphenomenon of, materiality or contingency or the unconscious source or instinct of the thinker. But from Hegel's point of view, this criticism is question-begging from the start. In his treatment, the topic of pure thinking has nothing to do with the thinker, the subject, consciousness, the mind. The topic rather raises as a problem the possibility of the intelligibility of (also) whatever is being touted as source or hidden origin, the conditions assumed in any such determinate identification.⁷ Any such criticism, in so far as it is a thinking, a judging, a claim to know, is always already a manifestation of a dependence on pure thinking and its conditions, and such "moments" of pure thinking are to delimit the normative domain of intelligibility (what can *rightly* be distinguished from what, or posited as "ground," for example) and not any process or series of events that goes on in supposed independence of the empirical world. Pure thinking is neither dependent on nor independent of the empirical or materiality or the brain or whatever new absolute comes into fashion. That question already manifests a misunderstanding of the question of pure thinking itself.⁸ This is not to deny that any reference to thinking presumes a thinker, indeed a living, purposive rational thinker. That issue, which is important to Hegel, will be the subject of chapter 7. It is, rather, to argue for the autonomy of the question of "any thinking at all." That is, it is to insist on the priority and autonomy of "logic," and that means for him its complete self-determination of its own "moments." (As just noted, one could put this another way: it is to insist that there is such an enterprise as philosophy. That is, all philosophy, from Plato's *Republic* to Descartes's *Meditations* to Wittgenstein's *Tractatus* to Quine's *Word and Object*, is an enterprise of pure thinking, "confirmed" not by empirical evidence but through the self-

7. Paraphrasing a famous title by Henrich, one could say that *this* is "Fichte's original insight," expressed by saying that any limitation of the *Ich* by the *nicht-Ich* must be both a limitation and a *self*-limitation, that the *nicht-Ich* is a *posit* of the *Ich*, that the requirement that the *nicht-Ich* be a thought-determination (posited) does not mean it is simply a thought. For a full case for this claim, see Pippin 2000.

8. A much more radical sort of attack on the enterprise would be to try to show the complete relativity of any such normative domain, fixing any relation of dependence, or distinction between source and manifestation, in a way admittedly arbitrary but useful in some sense or other, and so avoiding any stable commitment altogether. Rortean pragmatism has been understood in this way, and Nietzsche has also been subject to this interpretation (as well as to the materialist or scientific one). But any such claim, just insofar as it is a claim, would still not be able to avoid some reliance on what Hegel is calling pure thinking. Another way to make the point would be to note that by pure thinking Hegel basically means: philosophy.

examination by pure thinking of itself.) Hegel's enterprise in the *SL* takes as its topic the categories or "thought-determinations" (*Denkbestimmungen*) necessary for thought to have determinate objective content, an enterprise that at the same time specifies the determinations inherent in the possible determinacy of being itself.⁹

As will be obvious in the next two chapters, I think we start heading in the right direction if we consider the *Logic's* project under the rubric John McDowell introduced in the second lecture in *Mind and World*,¹⁰ the "unboundedness of the conceptual." The formulation is inspired by Wittgenstein's remark that "When we say, and mean, that such-and-such is the case, we—and our meaning—do not stop anywhere short of the fact; but we mean: this-is—so."¹¹ McDowell's different formulation of the same point is that "there is no ontological gap between the sort of thing one can mean, or generally the sort of thing one can think, and the sort of thing that can be the case."¹² Or, even more to the point of the present study, "The constraint comes from outside thinking, but not from outside what is thinkable."¹³

The context of McDowell's discussion is perception and perceptual knowledge claims, so it is of limited use for the details of *The Science of Logic*, which is some sort of claim to a priori knowledge. Moreover, the relation of thinking and the thinkable in the *Logic* faces a problem not germane to McDowell's concerns in his book. The problem is: how to account for the *determinate* moments of "any thinking of the knowable," such that they count as the determinate moments of the knowable itself?¹⁴ In the expansive sense of the German *Wissenschaft*, Hegel's formulation ("a science of pure thinking") means first of all that it is an account of, a theory of, pure thinking

9. Admittedly, this topic quickly becomes quite complicated. For Hegel, philosophy must be a science, and that means its claims must be made with necessity, and he wants thereby to claim that formulations about "the Absolute" or its absence or its presence in its absence made by the likes of Schlegel and Schelling are also such "scientific" claims. This then means that they rely on a scientific logic that they do not and cannot account for. Schlegel, for example, would want to claim that Hegel's insistence about science must be able to be wrong, that there may be no such science, and Hegel is just begging the question from the start.

10. McDowell 1996.

11. Wittgenstein 1973, §95. I discuss this so-called "identity theory of truth" at greater length in the following chapter.

12. McDowell 1996, 27.

13. McDowell 1996, 28.

14. I do not detect in McDowell a robust interest in a priori knowledge, but am unsure of his position.

(what pure thinking is), and he means a pure thinking that is a knowing, one that is onto objects as they are. In the logic of the day, that means he is talking primarily, but not exclusively, about judgments. (Not exclusively because he thinks the nature of judgments cannot be isolated from an account of concepts and inferences.) Pure thinking is thinking without dependence on the deliverances of sensibility, without reliance on experience. Traditionally the question inspired by the very formulation of such a project arises naturally: What, if anything, objective can be known just “by thinking,” without reliance on empirical experience? In the long tradition of pre-Kantian Western rationalism, that question was often understood to be asking: Are there *entities*, or aspects of reality, knowable only by pure thinking, thinking unaided by sensibility? Inspired by the pure thinking of mathematics as well as other considerations, the rationalist answer was that there were such entities, not available to empirical experience, but knowable by the light of reason, by pure thinking. There have been many candidates for such a status: souls, minds, God, universals, monads, substance, the Good.

Kant gave another sort of answer. There *is* something accessible only to pure thinking, but it is not some object or entity. The proper object of pure thinking is thinking itself: either the possibility of any thinking at all, which Kant called general logic; or, in a topic that Kant invented, the possibility of thought’s having objects at all, or knowledge, which he called transcendental logic. Thinking’s reflection on any thinking claiming to be knowledge, or a critique by reason of itself, could determine the form of any possible object of knowledge, and could specify as well what objects could never be objects of either empirical or pure knowledge. Thinking about thinking could determine what there is, and is not, to be known. The core of such a claim, for both Kant and Hegel, had especially to do with the implications of a relationship that they both insisted on between thought’s determination of what it is to be thinking (in the sense of knowing) and the conceptual content required for thinking to be thinking (in the sense of knowing) — that such content must be understood as what it was only by being known a priori to be such content. Distinctly philosophical knowledge, for that is what we are discussing, is and must determine for itself its own objectivity. More prosaically put, if there is to be such knowledge, it can’t be made true by something “outside” of judgment, to which it can be compared. Any such appeal to objectivity is “inside” judgment’s self-determination, a point made the most of among the idealists by Fichte. (To say that the *Ich* posits itself and in so doing pos-

its the *nicht-Ich* is his way of making this point. It has nothing to do with creating an external world by thinking it.)¹⁵ Thought was in this sense “self-determining”; concepts could be said to “produce their own content.” This involves revolutionary claims made first by Kant about the exclusively productive or spontaneous nature of thinking, and the inherently self-conscious nature of all thinking. Both claims were enthusiastically embraced by Hegel, and it will be the task of the next two chapters to explain the nature of these claims, and their implications as Hegel saw them, implications for philosophical truth quite different from those Kant drew.

This was not traditional rationalism because Kant denied any receptive relation between a domain of objects and pure thinking. Hegel agreed. Pure thinking had only itself as its proper object. It is an endlessly interesting aspect of this claim (and almost impossible to hold in mind properly) that thinking so conceived is not conceived as an entity or event, whether psychological or immaterial. Thinking is its own “object” only in the sense of what pure thinking is about—the activity of thinking necessary for it to be thinking, and necessary for it to be a thinking of (in the sense of knowing) objects. But, when the claim is formulated this way, Kant also seemed to say that philosophy could determine something about the objects of thought only insofar as they were subjected to “subjective” or “our” conditions, to conditions for the applicability of thought, a condition which itself required something other than thought, forms of sensible intuition unique to finite rational knowers. This was required for Kant because, in his most radical difference with the rationalist tradition, he conceived thinking as exclusively an activity, a “spontaneity,” and in no sense receptive.

There is no question that Hegel rejected what he understood to be such “subjective idealism,” and so rejected the Kantian claim that we know only phenomena, not things in themselves. In fact, Hegel never seems to tire of rejecting it at every chance he gets, noting that Kant seems to give with one hand (knowledge) what he takes away with the other (“merely” of appearances), and that he draws the inference from his demonstration that the exercise of our form of thought produces contradictory results, generates antinomies. Kant should have been led to question the adequacy of his understanding of our forms of thought.

And Hegel does not reject the notion by arguing that we *do* know the “things in themselves” that Kant said we couldn’t. The clearest statement of

15. See Pippin 2000.

his position is in §44 of the EL, where he rejects the concept altogether. He basically notes that if we define the notion by abstracting from any means we have for knowing, there is nothing to be known. We should not be surprised that we end up with something unknowable, a *caput mortuum*.

Equally simple, however, is the reflection that this *caput mortuum* is itself merely the product of thought, more specifically, [the product] of thought that has progressed to pure abstraction, [the product] of the empty I that makes this empty identity of itself into an object for itself. (§44)

And yet Hegel also never tires of saying that his own theoretical philosophy is like Kant's in that at its heart is a logic, an enterprise in which our thinking has itself as its proper object. He is also clear that such a theory of pure thinking is a successor to, not a further episode in, the history of modern rationalist "metaphysics." He also never tires of mentioning his debt to Kant, even given the strong disagreements. This sets the stage for the interpretive task in what follows. The following remark is typical, so typical that fidelity with it ought to function as something like a "necessary condition for the possibility of work on the Kant-Hegel relation."

The primary concern [*das nächste*] of the Kantian philosophy is thus that thinking is supposed to investigate itself, the extent to which it is capable of knowing. Nowadays, the Kantian philosophy has been left behind, and everybody wants to be at a point further on [*weiter*]. To be further along [*Weitersein*], however, has a double meaning: both to be further ahead and to be further behind. Looked at in clear light, many of our philosophical endeavours are nothing but the method of the old metaphysics, an uncritical thinking along [*unkritisches Dahindenken*] in a way everyone is capable of. (EL §41A)

This task is also connected to the two senses in which the appeal to the "ideal" in German Idealism can be understood. As already noted, if it is possible to identify some common core to the tradition classified as "German Idealist," it would at the very least be as a sustained critique of empiricism, the claim that the basic intelligibility of the world cannot be explained by the sheer deliverances of sensibility alone, together with the subsequent putative organization of such deliverances by abstraction, association, generalization, and so forth. This is connected as well with a rejection of empiricist accounts

of action, as if the basic engine of action is conative, with reason only of strategic use, only a means to satisfy desires.

As noted earlier, the best way to understand what makes German Idealism idealism is this anti-empiricism, now, post-Wilfrid Sellars, understood as the rejection of the possibility of and so any foundational reliance on givenness.¹⁶ “The given” is understood as noninferentially warranted *cognitive* states, such that any such putative state counts as knowledge of a kind, or a basis of knowledge, just by being experienced. By contrast—and here the heart of the idealist claim—any sensory interchange with the world (or even any intellectual receptivity) that is to be able to play any role in cognition can play such a role only if it always manifests a categorical structure. So of course the central questions have to be: What is the nature and status of this categorical structure (or pure thinking’s knowledge of its own structure and possibility, at the same time an account of any object’s knowability)? And what does “always manifests” mean? Moreover, while it might seem natural to think that if this categorical structure cannot be said to be derived from, contributed by, sense experience, it must be contributed “by us,” must be subjective, as if “imposed” by us on such sensible deliverances, this implication is clearly rejected by Hegel. Hegel thinks that this is Kant’s position, and, again, there is no question that he rejects that sort of subjective idealism (whether he is right that this is Kant’s position or not).¹⁷ What possibility is left?

It is perfectly clear to Hegel how much he is asking of us, how natural one (empiricism) or the other (subjective idealism) alternative seems, but he nonetheless insists we must leave this assumed alternative behind.

We must then reject the opposition between an independent immediacy in the contents or facts of consciousness and an equally independent media-

16. I am trying not to foreclose at this point (although I will want to later) “objective idealist” interpretations of “ideal,” as described briefly below. It is certainly also true that that sort of an objective idealism is also anti-empiricist.

17. It is not only Hegel’s view, but a very common one, inspired by what Kant himself says about the beginning of the critical period in his philosophy, as announced in his famous letter to Markus Herz (February 2, 1772).

Therefore, the pure concepts of the understanding must not be abstracted from sense perceptions, nor must they express the receptivity of representations through the senses; but *though they must have their origin in the nature of the mind*, they are neither caused by the object nor bring the object itself into being. In my Dissertation, I was content to explain the nature of intellectual representation in a merely negative way, namely to state that they were not modifications of the mind brought about by the object. However, I silently passed over the further question of how a representation that refers to an object without being in any way affected by it can be possible. (Kant 1999a, 133; my emphasis)

tion, supposed incompatible with the former. The incompatibility is a mere assumption, an arbitrary assertion. All other assumptions and postulates must in like manner be left behind at the entrance to philosophy, whether they are derived from the intellect or the imagination. (EL §78)

This might suggest—and has to many—another alternative, already mentioned. The “ideal” in German Idealism could also refer to something else. In some roughly Platonic sense, ideal could refer to an ideal or noetic (nonsensible) structure of reality, more real than, underlying, manifest imperfectly in, sensible deliverances in experience and itself accessible only to pure reason. Hegel’s own characterizations of idealism sometimes do not invoke the Kantian formulations noted above, but assert that idealism is constituted by the “unreality” or “untruth” of the finite. By contrast, what is “truly real” is the infinite, the Concept, the Absolute. We will need to understand those passages in their proper context, but in merely introducing his basic claims, it is already clear how difficult it will be to pin down Hegel’s core position, because, as we shall see, Hegel rejects an “objectivist” interpretation of such a categorical structure. This is of course not surprising. Hegel is supposed to be a dialectical thinker, and we would expect each one-sided alternative to be “sublatable” into a higher unity. His dissatisfaction with such one-sided alternatives is something frequently voiced by Hegel. For example, in the addition to EL §24, Hegel says (at least in this context, channeling his inner Schelling),

the logical is to be sought in a system of thought-determinations in which the antithesis between subjective and objective (in its usual meaning) disappears. This meaning of thinking and of its determinations is more precisely expressed by the ancients when they say that *nous* governs the world, or by our own saying that there is reason in the world, by which we mean that reason is the soul of the world, inhabits it, and is immanent in it as its own innermost nature, its universal.¹⁸

This passage already suggests that the subjective idealism/objective idealism alternatives are not the only alternatives, that this very formulation of

18. See also, in the greater *Logic*:

Anaxagoras is celebrated as the man who first gave voice to the thought that *Nous, thought*, is the principle of the world; that the essence of the world is to be defined as thought. In this, he laid down the foundation for an intellectual view of the universe, the pure shape of which must be *logic*. Logic has nothing to do with a thought *about* something which stands outside by itself as the base of thought; nor does it have to do with forms meant to provide mere *markings* of the truth; rather, the necessary forms of thinking, and its specific determinations, are the content and the ultimate truth itself. (21.34)

the alternatives has missed something crucial to Hegel. As we shall explore in detail in the next chapter, what any cognitive thinking does is to render something intelligible, a task that has many different dimensions. The truth of any such claim is often, of course, a matter of empirical experience, but the question of *what any such account is, what it is* to render successfully intelligible in any of these and many more senses, and what relation such renderings have to each other, is not, cannot be, an empirical matter. And “what it is to render successfully intelligible” need not at all be limited to “what we count as having done so.” Understanding what it is to render something intelligible is just thereby to understand the intelligibles, what there is to be thought—being. We shall see how far one can go in Hegel by developing such a thought.

Further, in Hegel’s treatment, as in Kant’s, rendering intelligible in any of these senses is not just to grasp a content; or, it is not an intuitional reception. Thinking is discursive; to think what is the case is to *assert that it is* (the basic unit of intelligibility in Hegel’s account is the judgment; assertion its linguistic manifestation), and that is something always open to challenge and interrogation. This means that a science of thinking is also a science of “reasons,” of ways of giving reasons in rendering anything genuinely or properly intelligible. It is in this sense, thinking’s determining for itself what it is to think, in the sense of judging what is the case for appropriate reasons, that there can be a “science of logic.”¹⁹

So there is at least to be a common claim in these alternatives, something like: there is some sort of rationally articulable, categorical structure without which the world would not be even empirically intelligible at all. We could even, at this stage, call this categorical structure (in a way very different from the contemporary understanding of formal logic) *the world’s “logic”* and this in the oldest sense of the *logos* inherent in all things. We want to know the status of this categorical structure: subjective, objective, or neither subjective nor objective, or somehow both subjective and objective. (Logic is not “formal” in Kant’s sense, that is, empty; but rather it is said to be formal

19. Even these simple formulations already introduce a deep complication. In ordinary contexts, we want to say that one has somehow to “see” what one can, by virtue of such “seeing,” assert. Hegel wants to characterize this situation in terms of what he calls the logic of reflection: a “positing” self-conscious spontaneity, or a positing reflection; an “external” reflection that provides the ground of this positing; resulting in a “determinate” reflection that expresses the unity of these moments. Hegel himself admitted that this is the most difficult aspect of his *Logic*, and the issue will reappear in what follows.

because it is a science *of form*. However, as we shall see, this does not mean that it is a science of special objects, thing-like entities. Such forms are said to be instead moments, *Denkbestimmungen*, thought-determinations, even “pulsations,” and that will require some unpacking.)²⁰

So to put Hegel’s idealism in summary form: Logic is the science of pure thinking. Pure thinking’s object is, and only is, itself. But this “object” is not a nature, an object. The *Logic* has nothing to do with “the mind” as a substance or thing. Hegel is following *both* Aristotle here — “That part of the soul, then, which we call mind (by mind I mean that part by which the soul thinks and forms judgment) has no actual existence until it thinks”²¹ — and Kant, for whom the claim that the “I think” must be able to accompany all my representations is a *logical point*, expresses the form of thought, and is not a claim about how the mind actually operates. If Hegel were making a claim about the mind’s nature, knowledge would be limited by its “instrument,” something Hegel had been vigorously denying since the introduction to the *Phenomenology*. In knowing itself, what pure thought knows is the possible intelligibility, the knowability, of anything that is. But the intelligibility of anything is just what it is to be that thing, the answer to the “what is it” (*ti esti*) question definitive of metaphysics since Aristotle.²² So in knowing itself, thought knows, of all things, *what it is* to be anything. Again, as for Aristotle, the task of metaphysics is not to say of any particular thing what it is. It is to determine what must be *true* of anything at all, such that what it is in particular *can* be determined by the special sciences (what in Scholasticism were called the *transcendentalia*). Or: it is to know what is necessarily presupposed in any such specification. (Of course the *Physics* and the *De Anima* are also philosophical sciences for Aristotle, but Hegel will have a Philosophy of Nature and a Philosophy of Spirit too.)²³

As we shall see over the course of the first three chapters, a Hegelian logic

20. See the useful account, and several clear formulations, in deVries 1993.

21. Aristotle 1995, 429a20–25. Kreines (2015) has developed a reading of what he calls Hegel’s “metaphysics of reason,” in a way that illuminates passages like these. But I am not sure how he understands “by virtue of” in “things are what they are by virtue of their concept” (Kreines 2015, 35); and just how we are to understand the status of the Concept and its various moments; what such *Denkbestimmungen* are. My claim is that Hegel’s debt to Aristotle is crucial in understanding his answers to such questions.

22. This in the sense to be explored in what follows: the inquiry into what it is to say of anything what it is.

23. There is a fine summary of Hegel’s Aristotle lectures in the *History of Philosophy* lectures by Ferrarin (2007, 105–95).

is also not an Aristotelian or Scholastic logic, not a descendant of the Port Royal logic, not a version of a Leibnizean/Wolffian conception of logic, is closer to but must still be distinguished from both what Kant calls “general logic” and that Kantian invention: “transcendental logic.” And it clearly cannot be interpreted in the terms fashioned by Frege for a predicate logic, or any version of a mathematical or symbolic logic. But we don’t get very far by understanding what the *Logic* is not. It is a truth of Hegelian logic itself that determinacy, in this case correctly identifying what a *Science of Logic* is, cannot be a function solely of a concept’s negative relation to what it is not. The concept must also have a determinacy, as he says, for-itself, however related he takes these two moments to be.

The structure of his book itself suggests—and this is of course not surprising in Hegel—the general shape of some kind of ever more adequate self-consciousness about the determination of a kind of conceptual content, that kind specifiable by thinking alone. In the *Logic*, that kind is the content appropriate to the conceptual capacities required for the thought of anything at all. (Given the judgmental character of intelligibility for Hegel, by “the thought of anything at all” I mean the thought of—in the sense of the knowledge of—anything’s being the case, anything’s being such and such, anything happening.) There can certainly be other determinants of content, empirical experience, for example. But *The Science of Logic* is not about concepts like “horse” or “Ferris wheel,” but about concepts, or conceptual capacities, necessary to render intelligible any objective content. This will not mean that such content “depends” for its intelligibility wholly on subjective capacities as if the content amounts to rule of thought understood as such a subjective capacity. It is Hegel’s position that the structure of reality is conceptual, *is* its intelligibility. The question is what Hegel means by this. Such an inquiry will culminate in something like “the concept of the Concept itself,” and so concerns a kind of logical (not psychological) full self-consciousness.²⁴ (According to Hegel, the Concept is the “ground and the source of all finite determinateness and manifoldness” [SL 12.23].) Again, pure thinking has only itself as its object.²⁵ That is, the dynamic of his book is

24. This difference between “pure” thinking, with only itself as its object, and thinking considered psychologically, is an important one throughout here, and is insisted on just as strongly by Hegel in the *Philosophy of Spirit*, §§465 and 467. I also discuss the issue in chapter 7, section 2.

25. I agree with Peter Rohs (1982, 4), when he notes that this formulation is the counterpart to Kant’s claim in the first *Critique*, B130, that all combination should be understood as an “activity of the understanding,” a *Verstandeshandlung*. Of course, this will not lead Hegel to any form of

internally self-critical. Implicit but ungrounded assumptions about such conceptual determination are exposed and shown to be inconsistent with some initial conceptual articulation, thus requiring revisions and reformulations. It is certainly the case that the final “logic of the Concept” makes conceptuality itself its theme, and, whatever else is going on in the *SL*, it is certainly the case that assumptions about conceptuality (especially about conceptual content or determinacy) were at work in the book’s prior accounts, but not attended to as such.²⁶ In *EL* §17, Hegel says that the “unique purpose, deed and goal” of his Science is “to arrive at the Concept of the concept and so to arrive at its return [into itself] and contentment [*Befriedigung*]” (*EL* §41).²⁷ And in the addition to §83 he says simply, “Only the Concept is what is true, and, more precisely, it is the truth of Being and of Essence. So each of these, if they are clung to in their isolation, or by themselves, must be considered at the same time as untrue.” This impression—of a self-critical, self-correcting internal process of reflection—is only strengthened toward the end of the *EL*, when Hegel writes about (or says, and one of his students takes it down), in summation of the point he has reached,

the concept that has carried itself out [*sich selbst ausgeführt*] in its objectivity, or the object that is inner purposiveness, essential subjectivity [*wesentliche Subjektivität*]. (§214A)²⁸

subjective idealism or noumenal skepticism or a mere category theory or a conceptual scheme idealism.

26. This is Hegel’s formulation of this point:

Thus it is the whole concept which we must consider, first as existent concept, and then as concept; in the one case it is concept only implicitly, in itself, the concept of reality or being; in the other, it is the concept as such, the concept that exists for itself (in more concrete forms, the concept as it is in the human being, who is endowed with thought, and also in the sentient animal and in general in organic individuality, although, of course, in these last it is not conscious and still less known; it is concept in itself only in inorganic nature).—Accordingly, the first division must be between the logic of the concept as being and of the concept as concept, or (if we want to avail ourselves of otherwise familiar, but very indeterminate and therefore very ambiguous expressions) in objective and subjective logic. (21.46)

27. *Befriedigung* or satisfaction is an important term. It signals that the question of what providing a sufficient ground or reason consists in, what counts as a successful explanation, is a matter of such satisfaction, of when the demand for explanation has been satisfied. This is not something logically obvious, or the same under the different assumptions that govern the three main “logics.” See the discussion in chapter 7.

28. See also the end of the remark to §215 on “overgrasping” (*übergreifende*) subjectivity, meant to distinguish it from the “one-sided” form with which it is often confused. Theunissen

As noted, the book was published in three installments in 1812, 1813, and 1816, and partially revised (book 1) in 1831.²⁹ In 1817 Hegel published a shorter version of the *Logic*, as the first part of his *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences* (with new editions and several changes in 1827 and 1830),³⁰ and it has become common to refer to the former as “the greater *Logic*,” and the latter as the *Encyclopedia Logic*. The former is an infamously and profoundly difficult book, written in a terminology that was unprecedented and never repeated; and the EL is only slightly more accessible. There is not even much consensus about answers to the two immediately obvious questions that it raises: What is the book about (what does Hegel mean by *logic*; in what sense is his science a science?), and what sort of demonstration or argument for his results does Hegel think he is providing? The suggestions sketched above about answers to these two questions will be pursued in a variety of ways in what follows.

An Emancipatory Logic?

Among the more unusual self-characterizations of Hegel’s project is that it has something to do with the realization of freedom. A typical example from the EL:

Since in thinking things over their true nature emerges and since this thinking is just as much my activity, that true nature is equally the product of my spirit insofar as the latter is a thinking subject. It is mine in accordance with my simple universality, i.e. as an I that is entirely with itself—it is the product of my freedom. (§23)

(1978) has a number of compelling things to say about Hegel’s general use of the notion of *übergreifen*. Aside from the work by Pinkard, Falk, Düsing, and a very few others, there has been some reluctance on the part of commentators to attend to the prominence Hegel gives to this logical notion of subjectivity. Fear of “subjective idealism” has often led to its contrary, a mystified “objectivism.” The issue will resurface several times in what follows. I take this quotation to be claiming that conceptual determinacy must be understood in terms of the activity of determining, and to be denying that this is a psychological matter. The watchwords for this study are simple: when Hegel says subjectivity, he means subjectivity. Only human beings are true subjects, but that categorization is not limited to finite, psychological subjectivity.

29. This is the conventional dating. Jaeschke (2010, 221) reports that despite the official *Erscheinungsdatum* of 1813, the second part, the *Logic of Essence*, actually appeared in December 1812.

30. For an indication of the more important changes, see Burbidge 2004, 163–68.

This sort of claim has several dimensions in Hegel. It refers to the *Logic* as the pure self-determination of thought by thought (which is thereby autonomous, wholly self-determining), and ranges over an account of the logic of freedom and of its actuality. That is, freedom in the sense of self-determination is, although a pure concept, actual.³¹ The culmination of the course of the demonstration in the greater *Logic* is the logic of the Concept, about which Hegel says that having reached this realm, we have reached the realm of subjectivity and “freedom” (SL 21.409). As we shall see in chapter 4, he makes a great deal out of the *Logic*’s distinctive doctrine of negation in explaining what he means by this, sometimes called “negativity.” He even says that the capacity for negation that he treats in the *SL* amounts to the “objective moment of the life of spirit by virtue of which a subject is a person, is free” (12.246). Later, in the account of the logic of the Concept itself, he says that “In the concept, therefore, the kingdom of freedom is disclosed” (12.15). In the addition to §31 of the *EL*, Hegel waxes poetic over such “logical” freedom, using a dramatic image to characterize the achievement of such a logic. Invoking his technical term for freedom, *Beisichsein*, being with one-self, he says,

This being with self [*Beisichsein*] belongs to free thinking, a free voyaging, where, with nothing under us and nothing over us, in solitude, alone by ourselves, we are purely at home with ourselves. (*EL* §31)³²

This should be seen in marked contrast to Kant, who might appreciate in a general way the practical implications of a critique of reason (e.g., limiting knowledge to make room for faith), but who remained, with one exception, pretty much a “philosopher’s philosopher,” intensely focused on the strength of the arguments about the possibility of synthetic a priori knowledge—his own argument and his opponents’. The one massive exception was Kant’s concern about the power and influence of moral skepticism, and he seemed aware in that context that a philosophical critique of practical reason was necessary for more than strictly theoretical reasons. But after Jacobi had caused such a public stir with his claim that modern or post-Kantian philosophy’s arrogation to itself of supreme critical authority had to terminate in nihilism, something like the public significance of philosophy was on every-

31. Cf. the discussion in Martin 2012, 14–15, 553–70.

32. He had begun to explain the freedom theme a bit more earlier, in *EL* §23.

one's mind, and this clearly played some role in Hegel's construction of a very large frame of significance within which to work.

To some extent this sense of significance has to do with that very project of the "self-grounding" of reason inherited from Descartes, intensified by Kant and Fichte, and challenged so publicly by Jacobi. If the modern age was to be characterized by allegiance to the supreme authority of reason, and in that sense to individual and collective autonomy, then it fell to philosophers to account for the source of the authority of reason, especially in terms of the traditional alternatives (revelation, faith, poetic inspiration, received tradition), and especially if that authority was to be "absolute." But there could be no justification for such authority except on the basis of some rational ground, so reason had to be understood as in some way *self-authorizing*, or in Kant's influential phrase, "self-legislating." This is very much the understanding of Kant that Hegel presented to his students in his *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*.

The standpoint of the philosophy of Kant . . . is in the first place to be found in the fact that thought has, through its reasoning, got so far as to grasp itself not as contingent, but rather as in itself the absolute ultimate . . . Thought grasped itself as all in all, as absolute in judgment; for it nothing external is authoritative, since all authority can receive authority only through thought.³³

A "Science of Logic" is the most important element in Hegel's fulfilling such an ambition. As we have seen, such a science is a "science of pure thinking." What any thinking does is to render something intelligible, a task that, as we shall see, has many different dimensions and is inseparable from the giving of reasons. But, as we have also noted, to say what something is, or to explain why something happened, or to understand the point or purpose of anything, is not just to present a picture or grasp a content. It is to judge, something always open to challenge and interrogation. Hegel decisively sides with Kant's view that thinking is discursive, and this means that a science of thinking is a science of "reasons," of ways of giving reasons in rendering anything genuinely or properly intelligible.³⁴ Eventually, as suggested

33. *LHP* 424.

34. An analogy here would be the sense in which we want to say that in perceptual judgments, if a judgment is made and challenged ("how do you know there was a dog there?"), and we answer something like "Because I saw it," this does not mean the experience on which the judgment is made is "immediate," conceptually unmediated. See the discussion in Pippin 2013c.

above, we would need a fully reflective account of the “ground of giving grounds” in some particular sense. In the practical domain, in Kant and the post-Kantians, I am free when I am acting on reasons about what ought to be done. This is a form of self-consciousness that, according to Kant, is paradigmatically embodied when I act *wholly* on reasons, and not just prudently or instrumentally, as when I act for the sake of ends I have not rationally determined I ought to have. To know on the basis of reasons that are likewise “absolute” or, in Kant’s terms, “unconditioned” is a parallel form of freedom, even though the claim to such a self-consciousness seems extremely ambitious.

While Hegel is a fully subscribed member of such a modern philosophical project (the project of “absolute reflection,” or complete critical self-grounding), he insisted that we had lost our way in carrying it out, and that a wholly new beginning had to be made (even though the new beginning was also the culmination and completion of prior attempts). Our science of reasons, ways of giving grounds and rendering rightly intelligible, had too narrowly fixed on a limited number of ways of understanding such “pure thinking,” and, more radically than philosophers like Kant, he thought that the stakes in getting this right were much higher than had been appreciated and could not be limited to philosophical problems alone. A form of life had begun to grow up around such a self-understanding of the authority of reason-giving understood in this way (a form of life still very much with us), and the practical implications of such a restricted sense of justification were becoming ever more visible and ever more disturbing.

That is, although it is often forgotten in the usual rush to condemn Hegel’s triumphalism, reconciliationism, Prussian accommodationism, and so forth, all of his major works express varying degrees of anxiety about the major norms and institutions, that basic form of life, emerging in Western Europe in the first third of the nineteenth century; “modernity” for want of a more precise word. Thanks to Hegel’s influence, the content of this anxiety has now become familiar, perhaps so familiar it now sounds like background noise, the constant rumble of the interminable “dissatisfactions of European high culture.”³⁵ The simplest post-Hegelian versions of what concerned Hegel are easy enough to call to mind. For example: the prevailing modern norms of epistemic authority, those governing the kind of accounts given by modern natural science, inevitably have the effect of “reifying” human subjects (confusing subjects with objects), and such human subjects themselves inevitably

35. Pippin 1999.

actually become, treat themselves and each other as, such reified objects. For Hegel, however, we could understand how to avoid such self-objectification only if we could understand how there could be such distinct subjects of thought and action that are also spatio-temporal objects in the natural world. (The relation between *Geist* and *Natur* in his *Encyclopedia* terms.) It is sometimes casually said that Hegel accepts that human thought inevitably produces contradictory results like this and that once we understand such an inevitability, we are in a position to accept it. But it is precisely the unacceptability of this result as a set of inconsistent judgments that inspires a theory of thinking adequate to the overcoming of such an unacceptable opposition. The problem, in other words, is in this sense (and not in any sense that is a relative to “logic” in “symbolic logic”) a “logical” problem.

Many other aspects of modernity are also traced back by Hegel to an inadequate understanding of what it is to render something intelligible, to render an action or an institution defensible. This may look like an abstract, idealist approach to the social problems of modernity (as if we would be better if we could just think better), but in just the same sense as Hegel will want to treat concept and intuition in experience as distinct but inseparable, he will want to say that so-called “material” issues (like the organization of the means of production, or the relations of power between capital and labor) are inseparable from forms of self-understanding, as inseparable as such forms are from their material embodiment. Moreover, while we may notionally assent to the major moral, ethical, religious, and political norms dominant in modern societies, they are nevertheless still, in Hegel’s account, experienced as “external,” not genuinely self-imposed or our own, not tied to what we have reason to do or believe, but alien, merely “positive,” in Hegel’s early term. In the same sense of “alienation,” the daily texture of our work experience can come to seem exclusively a concession to the realm of necessity and in no sense any sort of free self-expression. Because of the way modern individuals have come to understand their own individuality, they have created a fragmented, anomic social order that is nothing but a collection of atomistic parts in minimal external relations with one another, and so profoundly unsatisfying, incapable of generating significant forms of allegiance and identification. Most broadly put, in the terms Hegel uses in his lectures on fine art, we have to live now like some strange amphibian creatures, moving between two worlds, at home in neither, requiring of ourselves allegiances to dualities we do not know how to reconcile: individuality and familial and social whole, mechanism and teleology, necessity and freedom,

nature and Geist. (Of course what he is also suggesting is that amphibians *do* succeed in being completely at home in both worlds, yet fully in both, a kind of living or lived-out compatibilism. This is possible for us if we achieve the right self-understanding and if that self-understanding is embodied in our institutions and practices.)

This situation means above all that absent such self-understanding and embodiment, we do seem to ourselves at home in neither; we have not achieved or realized freedom, already in Kant a kind of “absolute” value. (Human beings have infinite and inestimable worth, but only as such free beings.) Or, in Michael Theunissen’s terms, we have managed to understand and to realize only a kind of ersatz freedom: successful domination (*Herrschaft*), a way of embodying a relation between independence and dependence, self and other, that typifies, according to Theunissen’s Hegel, “metaphysical thinking” itself.³⁶ What we need is a way of understanding ourselves and our relations to others and the world that would make possible the overcoming of all such fundamental “strangeness” or “alienness,” a relation to our own sensible lives more reconciled and integrated than the “ruling” relationship Hegel attributed to Kant’s philosophy.³⁷ All these ruling or mastering relations could be properly understood in their rightly “negative” relation to nature, to others, and to our own selves, but when properly understood, as a negation that could itself be “negated” if understood properly by Hegel’s speculative science, restoring some sort of harmony.³⁸

Expressions of this sort of dissatisfaction are just as prominent in the *SL* as in so many other works by Hegel, especially those from his early and Jena period. In the 1812 preface to the *SL*, Hegel again begins by addressing

36. Theunissen (1980, 59ff.) means to refer to the orientation point for traditional metaphysics, standard predication, in which a subject, a particular, is “subsumed” under a universal, a predicate. The difference between such “thought forms” enabling a form of concrete self-understanding that encourages certain social relationships, and a logical form understood as itself an instance of domination, is not one I understand well in Theunissen’s account. But if we conceive of freedom as avoiding being subject to the will of others, subjecting them to our will if necessary to accomplish this, and if we think of individual freedom as “rule” over ourselves, we have already manifested a deep dependence on a way of thinking about freedom that is incomplete and so insufficient.

37. Cf. the opening pages of Henrich 1976 for a fuller description of this situation in these terms (and for a brief, clear statement of the central problem of Hegel interpretation).

38. Hegel is unusual in describing the origin of philosophy not in wonder, or in the ascent of eros, or in confusions and dilemmas that arise in the everyday and ordinary, and not in frustration over the endlessness of philosophical speculation, but in the unique feature of the modern age, alienation, division, even what he called a “torn apartness” (*Zerissenheit*).

what Jaspers would later call “the spiritual condition of the age,” and again he identifies *a way of thinking* as the most important characteristic of our age, a way he calls “the understanding,” *Verstand* (especially as Locke and Kant understood it). The dominance of this mode of account-giving has left us spiritually impoverished, like, he says, a richly adorned temple without a “holy of holies”—no metaphysics, no theology, and, most important of all, nothing to replace them. We have just common sense and the fixity and rigidity of *Verstand*. In the introduction to the work, he again notes that “the reflection of the understanding has seized hold of philosophy” (21.29), leaving us to treat issues that cannot be solved empirically, the most important and pressing human issues, as matters of mere private opinion.³⁹

In the preface to the second edition of the EL, Hegel’s language even assumes a religious or spiritual tonality. He says his own understanding of the ultimate condition of intelligibility, the “idea,” is “concrete spiritual unity” (*die konkrete, geistige Einheit*), and contrasts it with the restrictions of *Verstand*, which provides us with merely “abstract, spiritless identity” (*abstrakten geistlosen Identität*). In an extraordinary passage from the *Phenomenology*, Hegel claimed that the task of philosophical education in antiquity was to break the hold of sensuous particularity and elevate us to the universal, whereas now we have the opposite task, to find a way to give “life and actuality” to the universals that dominate all of thinking. That task

consists in actualizing and spiritually animating the universal by means of the sublation of fixed and determinate thoughts. (*PhG* §32)

This sounds exactly like the task of the *SL*, although it has been hard for commentators to find “the spiritual animation.” Indeed, this all seems to promise something quite extraordinary and, no doubt to contemporary ears, something quite implausible, a treatment of “logic” in some way in the service of an emancipatory ideal—an *emancipatory logic*, of all things.⁴⁰

39. Theunissen (1974, 321) also draws our attention to the bearing of this way of thinking about thinking on Marx in the latter’s attempt to “expose” the inner logic of capitalism. The relation of capitalist and worker is no longer a *Seinslogik* relation of master and bondsman, in existence because of a direct assertion of constant power over another, but mediated by the “logic of reflection,” the *Wesenslogik*, a logic of mediated mutual self-definition and deep opposition. (One where all surplus value is created by workers and owned by capitalists.) “Contradiction” in the Hegelian sense thus becomes (or already implicitly is) a “Kampf um die Macht.”

40. Hegel formulates this emancipatory ideal in a number of different ways that are not always easy to reconcile with each other. The simplest is expressed in the first addition to EL §19.

Hegel's unease with all this, together with Rousseau's incalculable influence, and similar concerns in figures like Schiller and the early romantics, is what begat those familiar later claims about the "ideological" nature of bourgeois philosophy, the one-dimensionality of modern societies, the totalization of instrumental reasoning, the dominance of "identity thinking," the crisis of the European sciences, the colonization of the life-world, and so forth.⁴¹ And while all such critiques can be traced back to Hegel, he does not make the case for such limitations by contrast with a positive or utopian theory, as is the case in many of these examples. His claim to philosophical glory is exactly as Theunissen has described it: that the proper exposition (*Darstellung*) of some mode of understanding is just thereby an internal manifestation of these limitations (*Kritik*).⁴² This is not a straightforward proposal. It depends on an adequate account of the most general covering term for the moments of failure or breakdown in the *Logic's* development: what Hegel calls *Schein* or semblance. Some determination of what it is *to be* "finitude" or "limit," some concept essential to possible intelligibility, is shown to be the mere *Schein* of finitude or limit. The notion is just as difficult and fraught with potential question-begging as Marx's claim that capitalism can be understood as in itself self-critical, self-undermining, ultimately self-

He contrasts our understanding of powerful skills and technical competencies with the cultivation of "one's spirit for higher things," and he hopes that the youth of his day will not settle for "the mere straw of cognition that remains on the outside of things."

41. This—that all of this goes back to Hegel's critique of *Verstand*—is true even of positions that don't seem to be historically derivative of Hegel. Heidegger's attack on Western rationalism as a forgetting of Being (that we have forgotten how to ask the right questions properly) is clearly of the same sort, as are Heidegger's worries that the formal requirements for the symbolically calculable can come to count as (be "imposed" as) ontologically definitive, the measure of "the real." This becomes a central feature of what he came to call "the age of the world picture." Heidegger is no doubt thinking of such "reverse engineering" ontologies as Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*, Russell's *The Philosophy of Logical Atomism*, and Carnap's *The Logical Structure of the World*.

42. These terms, "*Darstellung*" and "*Kritik*," are Michael Theunissen's. I follow much of his pioneering approach, but without the Christology. Theunissen (1980, 13) is explicitly thinking of Marx's claim that the proper exhibition of capitalist political economy is just thereby a critique, and he cites one of Hotho's (apparently) notes from one of Hegel's *Logic* lectures in 1823, that "the activity of forms of thought and their critique of knowledge must be united" (15). Falk's splendid book from 1983 should also be mentioned as in this space of interpretation. There is much more to say about all of this, but one can already say that Hegel's approach will make it very hard to fit him into Strawson's (1959) famous categories of "descriptive" or "revisionary" metaphysics. The *right* description of some aspect of a way of making sense already must involve a revision to that way's standard self-understanding. A proper description of a metaphysical project shows it to be unavoidably *self-revising*, at least if Hegel is right about past metaphysical projects.

contradictory, something that can be shown by nothing more than a proper presentation of its own inner “logic.”

The idea that the basic problem with modern self-understanding is some sort of “totalization” or “absolutization” of a form of account-giving that should be understood instead in its proper partiality is what could be called the “critical theory” reaction to and appropriation of Hegel. Far more prevalent in the past fifty years or so has been the sweeping charge, often explicitly addressed to Hegel as the Ur-Rationalist or Ur-Philosopher, that the very search for even some sort of polysemous and contextualized nontotalized “universal” is the core of the problem (that is, the problem is philosophy itself, or self-grounding reason itself, with Hegel and his *Logic* as the supreme representative of such an ambition), and what we must do is find some way of affirming, acknowledging, letting be—and here the list is endless—difference, otherness, the existential individual, Dasein, the subaltern, the absolute indeterminacy of sense, and so forth. (“Il n’y a pas de hors-texte” is another way of introducing the infinite indeterminacy of text, the ubiquity of text so understood.) This has led to various forms of radical incommensurability claims, and so to radical relativisms and, inevitably, radical decisionism as the only possible antifoundationalist origin of any norm. (In Alain Badiou, for example, and, even more ominously, in Carl Schmitt.) This latter reaction, as well as the former, assumes what has never been established: that we have understood what Hegel means by the “concrete universal.”

However, this anxiety, and Hegel’s obvious dissatisfactions with what he clearly considers the most typical philosophical representatives of this form of life, are also counterbalanced by a vast ambition and self-confidence for which Hegel is even more famous, even if not influential. This combination creates quite a complicated point of orientation that must be addressed before one can get a handle on his most important book. Stated in the simplest possible terms, Hegel’s diagnosis of the fix we have gotten ourselves into consists in the claim that we have not properly understood how to understand ourselves and the social and natural world in which we dwell. This is not, though, because we have simply been regularly mistaken, the victim of false philosophies, the wrong ideas. It is due to the inevitable partiality and one-sidedness of various ruling concepts (let us say, for shorthand, norms for explanation and justification, the normative structure of “the space of reasons”). This can be apparent only retrospectively and within some systematic account of their interrelation. Even more crudely put: we have “thought ourselves” *into* this dissatisfying existence, and *the way* we have thought our-

selves into it, if properly understood, can also itself show us a way *out*, a way Hegel wants to characterize as the completing or culmination of “the understanding,” *Verstand*, in a synthetic, dynamic, and comprehensive reason, or *Vernunft*, and not as the rejection of modern rationality—again, as if that notion were simply a mistake or an ideological tool of the oppressor to dupe the masses.⁴³ If we understand this properly, we will be able to comprehend why the institutions of modern society, however limited and alienating, are *also* now the incipient realization of human reason: why the culmination of Christianity is incipiently the doctrinally thin version of Protestantism that Hegel approved of, why the achievements of modern or romantic art actually amount to the incipient completion of the human need for art as a major vehicle of self-knowledge, why we are entering a postphilosophical age, not because philosophy has been exposed as illusory and impossible, but because the love of wisdom has become wisdom.

In fact, there is, from Hegel’s point of view, reason to believe that the complexity of this situation has created something quite unprecedented that only his philosophy, with its ability to explain the “positive” role of the negative, can account for. Life in modern societies seems to have created the need for uniquely dissociated doxastic states, wherein we sincerely believe ourselves committed to fundamental principles and maxims we are actually in no real sense committed to, a situation evinced by what we in fact do. (This is the sense in which Kierkegaard thought most modern people were—that is, were not—“Christians”).⁴⁴ The principles can be consciously and sincerely acknowledged, but given the principles they are (*Verstand*), cannot be integrated into a livable, coherent form of life. Or we *are* committed to various policies that, nevertheless, we would, again in all sincerity, disavow, even

43. Hegel’s clearest formulation of how his theory of thinking will look is in the EL, §§80, 81, 82. He wants to show how a model of thinking as “understanding” develops antitheses, or becomes “dialectical,” setting the stage for a “speculative” moment that amounts to making something “positive” out of these negative results.

44. For all of Kierkegaard’s explicit and contemptuous anti-Hegelianism, this situation is perfectly Hegelian, given that Hegel defines “the one thing needful to achieve scientific progress [as] . . . the recognition of the logical principle that negation is equally positive” (SL 21.38). In Kierkegaard’s terms, those who take themselves to be Christian are really *not Christians*, where this does not mean they are Muslims or Jews or atheists; they *are* NON-Christians. And conversely, there is also a principled way of not-being a Christian (realizing its enormous difficulty, perhaps its impossibility), which is the only way one can be a Christian. (This touches on a well-known objection to Hegel: that he confuses contrariety with contradiction. That will be discussed later.) I use Kierkegaard as a dramatic example, but there any number of ordinary ones. “We all believe” that global warming is precipitating an unprecedented catastrophe. Do we?

though our actions betray us.⁴⁵ In his early works, Hegel claimed that the need for modern philosophy itself arises as an attempt at a reconciliation of what modern philosophy left in “disunity” (*Entzweiung*, DS 9), and a striking sort of disunity is this dissociated relation to ourselves. (Often the task of the *SL* is said to be transcending the limitations of “representational thought” [EL §13Z] or the “philosophy of reflection,” all avatars of *Verstand*.)

Hegel of course does not believe the modern social and historical world is the way it is because people have been paying too much attention to limited and one-sided philosophers. (This is what Marx seemed to think when he claimed that Hegel had everything upside down, had us walking about on our heads, that Hegel thought that the social world was the way it is because of the thoughts, the oughts, people believed.) He often calls attention to the fact that philosophical concepts, what he calls “thought-determinations” (*Denkbestimmungen*), “instinctively and unconsciously pervade our spirit everywhere” (*SL* 21.17–18). Moreover, the problem is not the contents of our beliefs but the way we have come to collectively regulate what is believable, and these norms are not manifest, attended to much, in explicit attitudes. Our norms for authoritative explanations and for how we justify ourselves to each other are imbricated in the everyday fabric of a form of life, and philosophy is as much an *expression* of an age as it is that age *comprehended* in thought. (How it can be both is itself a philosophical theme: the relation of concept to “actuality.”) But Hegel in *The Science of Logic* concentrates not on an experiential (or “phenomenological”) limitation in a form of self-understanding but on the limitation of the form itself, considered, he says, in abstraction from its experiential manifestation. He goes so far as to remind us that the logic is “the realm of shadows, the world of simple essentialities, freed of all sensuous concretion” (21.43). This would seem to have as an unavoidable implication at the very least a caution about the limitations of Hegelian *logic*, a warning that however central the *Logic* is to everything else Hegel wants to say, it is still a restricted and limited picture of thought’s self-determination. A “realm of shadows” does not seem to be a compliment; it even seems, paradoxically, to be a vaguely self-critical remark since it echoes the kind of thing Hegel says about *Verstand* and metaphysics. It is also a striking, even astonishing image, a realm of shadows, especially since the shadows are “moving,”

45. In Pippin 2008 I try to show what conception of subjective mindedness and objective, public deed we need, according to Hegel, in order to account for such states, and suggest why they should not be seen as exceptional, or isolated puzzle cases. See chapter 6 of that book.

animated, a dance of shades.⁴⁶ In the rationalist tradition, of which Hegel is some sort of card-carrying member, the sensible world we muck around in is supposed to be the realm of shadows. It would still be possible to say that the ultimately intelligible, the self-determining concept of the Concept, the absolutely thinkable, thinkability itself (what we conclude the *Logic* with), is a reflective illumination that allows us to see *the world-in-its-shadows*, to see its structure of intelligibility in a way it never exists, isolated as such. (So understood they never cease to be shadows, given Hegel's radical hylomorphism—to be defended in the following—but they are fully determinate shadows, sharply defined, not fuzzy anymore.) The *Realphilosophie* would return us to the embodied form of these making-intelligibility-possible forms, *Natur* and *Geist*.⁴⁷

Nevertheless, Hegel does place serious explanatory weight on these “thought-determinations” and their proper contextualization that, however “instinctively and unconsciously” they function, is hard to exaggerate. And, accordingly, for him this imbrication of such thought-determinations in how we actually hold each other to account also requires a historical as well as a systematic account, because such general norms change and, Hegel thinks, change in ways that can be rendered intelligible. (In section 14 of the EL, Hegel says explicitly it is the “*same development of thinking*” [*diesselbe Entwicklung des Denkens*] that occurs in the history of philosophy as occurs “purely,” in the logical development of thought itself, freed from its historical exteriority).⁴⁸ Thus, an account of the *Logic* must be an account both of

46. He continues such characterizations in the Philosophy of Nature, pointing out that the richness and vitality of nature become, “in the quietude of thought” rather like a “dull northern fog” (PN §246Z).

47. The other telling passage about what Hegel calls the “formal” character of logic (as the “absolute form, which is implicitly totality and contains the pure idea of truth itself” [12.25]) occurs in the introductory material for the logic of the Concept, “Of the Concept in General,” where he disputes the idea that in making a transition to the Philosophies of Nature and Spirit we are somehow “filling in” content that has been abstracted from. “The logic rather exhibits the rise [*Erhebung*] of the *idea* up to the level from which it becomes the creator [*Schöpferin*] of nature, and passes over to a form of *concrete immediacy* whose concept, however, again shatters [*zerbricht*] this shape also in order to realize itself as *concrete spirit*” (12.25). I discuss this idea in chapter 9.

48. Hegel is well known for being responsible for the academic study of the history of philosophy as such, for a philosophical study of the history of philosophy. (The same is famously true for the academic study of the history of art.) In his *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, he frequently explains that different philosophies are partial versions of a single truth, for example in the way a man, a youth, and a child are all one and the same individual. See also EL §13 and SL 21.76 (“What is the first in science had of necessity to show itself to be the first historically”), and the second addition to EL §86. He is also here a little more cautious about this putative identity

the unique sorts of “logical” *limitations* and recoveries it sets out and at least implicitly about the *bearing* of such a demonstration, what the implications are for a form of life that embodies such a form of self-understanding.⁴⁹ That there is such a bearing at all is already an indication that Hegel thinks that a way of understanding understanding has various action-or-praxis implications, can even be said to be action-guiding (or “world-constituting”) in a way, and not just with respect to the logic of notions like freedom or individual. Even “positing reflection” or “the syllogism” has such implications.

Thus, it would not be an exaggeration to say that Hegel’s basic claim, according to the way of reading him I will defend, is that we have not properly understood the “grammar” of spirit (the logic of the self-relation, both individual and collective, that makes up spirit), and this is connected with our failure to understand the grammar of possible renderings-intelligible or account-givings in general. (These are connected because of the necessarily self-reflexive nature of account-givings, the topic of chapter 3.) And it would also not be an exaggeration to say that, for Hegel, once we do understand it, we (at least we philosophers) will be freed from the illusion that some particular form of account-giving (like modern *Verstand*) could be taken to be “absolute”; the proper relativization (historically and systematically) of different accounts of account-giving will have been made.⁵⁰ Or, stated in its most surprising form: Hegelian philosophy has no distinct doctrine of its own; its content is the right understanding of past attempts at account-giving in their limitations and interconnection.

Although this is clearly Hegel’s sense of the significance of the *Logic*, the notion of a “living” or organic or properly concrete or animated understanding of thought itself, what I have called the problem of the bearing of such a logic on a form of life, has remarkably little resonance in the literature on Hegel’s book. This is largely because, before one could address the issue, one

between the *Logic* and the history of philosophy. At least he admits that there are also “deviations.” I don’t claim these assertions are clear. I cite them here only as reminders that the question of the bearing of the *Logic* on nonlogical matters of self-understanding must be kept in mind.

49. This latter is what is known as the problem of Hegel’s “Realphilosophie,” the two main divisions of the *Encyclopedia* after the *Logic*, and all else that he had to say about art, religion, and world history itself.

50. Again, the *bearing* of this systematic recapitulation, what it means that it is possible, is an independent and crucial question. The possibility of this philosophical self-consciousness is supposed itself to manifest potentialities in some aspects of a form of life that are *themselves* coming to self-consciousness. It is in this sense that philosophy is “its own time comprehended in thought” (and not autonomous, the creative thoughts of individual philosophers).

would have to have figured out at the least the basic position concerning *what* is supposed to have such a bearing, and the great obscurity of the text made that very difficult. At any one point or another in the text, it is very hard to know with any confidence what are the alternatives to Hegel's actual claim, and (in a logic Hegel was quite sympathetic to) if one can't do *that*, one can't determine what the claim is. The book has produced no standard commentaries, and even in periods of philosophical history where Hegel played an important role, the *Logic* was hardly the center of the discussion.

The Concept

At the very least, one can say that the subject matter of the *SL* clearly appears to be concepts, or rather items more like metaconcepts, a series of very general nominalized predicates and nominalized verbs that figure in, characterize the types of, any first-order conceptual discrimination and explanation. (We don't, at such a first order, discriminate, or predicate by invoking "becoming," "substance," "finite," "essence," or "the idea of the good.") Hegel regularly calls the concepts that he discusses "categories," and that at least suggests that he thinks that the *Logic*'s categories, while themselves concepts,⁵¹ delimit *kinds* of concepts and conceptual capacities, and thereby the possible objects of such determinations. (How, and in what sense, extraconceptual *objects* enter the picture is, in effect, the basic problem in understanding the book.) These categories can be considered rules for the possible empirical or practical specification of any first-order conceptual discrimination, for what sorts of concepts of objects there must be. In the 1831 preface he tells us that the "condition of true knowledge" is "the treatment of concepts and of the moments of the concept in general" (21.16). Although this issue will have to be discussed in detail, I mean here the kind of distinction Hegel makes in the logic of the Concept.

There is no question of demonstrating for a word chosen from ordinary life that in ordinary life too the same concept is associated with that for which philosophy uses it, for ordinary life has no concepts, only representations of the imagination, *and to recognize the concept in what is otherwise mere representation is philosophy itself*. (21.130, my emphasis)

51. In the second edition of book 1, Hegel added the remark that Kant had thought quality, quantity, relation, and modality were mere "titles," but they were in fact concepts, just "more general" (21.66).

Although Hegel devotes surprisingly little space to any such discussion of what he is doing in the book (in effect, he just does it),⁵² the ambition of the treatise clearly is not meant to be limited to some isolated domain of discourse. Rather, as a “logic,” it appears to question the very possibility of rendering anything intelligible, offering a satisfying account,⁵³ or “conceptualizing,” and at such a level of attempted comprehensiveness, we can say that the enterprise is, or at least appears to be, something like *an account of all possible account-givings*, a scope that would include the basic form of everything from ethical justifications (“That is unjust; you shouldn’t do it”), to empirical judgments (“That’s not a dog, it’s a fox”), to the Second Law of Thermodynamics.⁵⁴

And again that looks like a theory of conceptuality, the heart of the determinate generality presumed in account-giving formulated in whatever way one likes: judging (asserting), explaining, understanding.⁵⁵ At this point, this

52. Cf. Theunissen (1978, 88ff.) and Jaeschke’s response (2010, 222).

53. “Satisfying” in the sense mentioned in EL §17, quoted above.

54. The basic claim is that Hegel’s *Encyclopedia* is best understood as a theory of adequate or satisfying comprehension, an enterprise that must presuppose a general account of any possible account-giving. See also chapter 2 of Pippin 2008, which is a later version of a 1999 article. That 2008 work concentrated on the implications of such an approach for Hegel’s account of “nature” and “spirit” and the relation between them, and did not address the ambitions of a *Science of Logic*. A preliminary account of what that (the *Logic* as about possible intelligibility) might look like was presented in Pippin 1989 (see p. 40 on an “account of all account giving”), but that was sketchy and programmatic. And I am certainly not the only one defending the centrality of account-giving success in understanding the *Logic*. See Pinkard (1988) on “the explanation of possibility,” or recently, Kreines (2015), about which more in chapter 9. My 1989 book seems to have left the impression with some that I thought Hegel’s work was an investigation of “how we have to think about things” and had as its object merely “our conceptual scheme,” what the requirements for pure thinking of anything are, be the world as it may. That was not the position I attributed to Hegel. I am trying to complete such an interpretation in this work and foreclose such a reading. In my statement there that the *Logic* is not about “deducing the existence of the external world,” the key issue is *existence* (“Krug’s pen” issues); in my statement that it is not about “spinning conceptual determinations out of thin air,” the key term is “thin air.” The *Logic*’s conceptual moments are self-determined, thinking’s determination of thinking (their source is thinking itself, not thin air), and they bear not on questions of existence but on the *actuality* of the world. Martin (2012) in his remarks on these passages does not seem to me to appreciate these emphases, or that the interpretation of Hegel in that 1989 book is already close to what he is calling “critical ontology” (9). On the other hand, responsibility for such impressions as Martin’s is mine, for tossing around too casually terms like “conceptual scheme,” as if there could be others, as if there is a scheme-content distinction.

55. The relations between concept, judgment, syllogism, and system, or the various elements of an “account,” will emerge frequently in what follows. Another analogue to Hegel’s enterprise comes from Frege (1980, §87), when, in the *Foundations of Arithmetic*, he noted that the laws of

is a vague characterization. It would seem to cover everything from what Kant, Frege, and Wittgenstein would regard as formal logic (understood as the “laws of thought,” the laws that determine what could be an intelligible thought about anything at all)⁵⁶ to laws governing the possibility (as Kant would put it) of determinate thought *about objects*, given that there are domains of kinds of objects that would require different “accounts.” The broad notion of “giving a logos” will have to be specified further. It will be especially important since Hegel identifies what are in effect three different “logics,” each governed by apparently very different notions of conceptual determinacy.

Here is a clear example of Hegel saying what I am claiming he is saying. It is a passage that touches both on his unusual account of the self-constituting character of human self-understanding (in the way assumed in the summary above) and on the general project of the *SL*.

The most important point for the nature of spirit is the relation, not only of what it implicitly is in itself to what it actually is, but of what it knows itself to be to what it actually is; because spirit is essentially consciousness, this self-knowledge is a fundamental determination of its actuality. As impulses the categories do their work only instinctively; they are brought to consciousness one by one and so are variable and mutually confusing, thus affording to spirit only fragmentary and uncertain actuality. To purify these categories and in them to elevate spirit to truth and freedom, this is therefore the loftier business of logic. (21.16–17)

Finally, it is by means of such a project that he wants to demonstrate something crucial in his account of “the understanding” that we started with. That is, we will have understood the limitations of that characteristic of *Verstand* he mostly describes metaphorically: its static or lifeless isolation of conceptual discriminatory powers that are actually in some sort of a “living relation” to each other, that even manifest what he calls, in another (baffling) metaphor, the “life pulse” of the Absolute. The *Logic*, then, will mostly (two-thirds of it, the “objective” logic) be about limitation, one-sidedness, failure

logic were not like the laws of nature, but were “the laws of the laws of nature.” As we shall see, Hegel too wants to say that the truths of his logic apply not to things or objects, but to the *Sache* or the *Wesenheiten* of things.

56. For an exemplary treatment of what this notion could mean in these figures, see Conant’s influential 1991 book.

(“negativity,” what in fact is the life-pulse of the Absolute). And in his typical turn of phrase, that negativity will provide a positive result, the integrative systematicity of *Vernunft*.⁵⁷

In the terms that Hegel will introduce, his claim in the *SL* can be put this way. The culmination of Hegel’s theoretical position is a doctrine about what

57. There are two ways to approach this feature of Hegel’s project, in both the *Phenomenology* and the *Science of Logic*. One way, given a good run for its money in Bowman 2013, is to characterize Hegel as a radical “skeptic.” The realm of nature, for example, what Hegel calls the domain of “self-externality,” cannot be fully known. This means in this context that “judgments about nature do not fully count as knowledge” (136), and this is because finite things “are not fully real.” Nothing in this domain “has its full determinateness by virtue of its own essence” (134). (This “idealism of the finite” is a major dimension of Stern’s (2009) interpretation as well.) But if we explore what that unusual phrase means — “has its full determinateness” — I think we will find that the limitation of the finite is that its intelligibility is limited, not that there is something “deficient” or “incomplete” in its existence.) Finally (and this is the second approach mentioned above) it seems much more in keeping with Hegel’s general reconciliationism to characterize him both as distinguishing various domains of possible knowledge (within which, *relativized to that domain*, a claim does count as genuine knowledge), and as characterizing the presuppositions of such a domain as adequately accounted for only by appeal to principles assumed but not explicit in the constitution of such a domain. See Hegel’s use of “one-sided” and “incomplete” (rather than, more skeptically, “not knowledge”) at 12.154. When Hegel is discussing the limitations of finite thought, he mostly emphasizes the fixity, rigidity, and distinctness assumptions of *Verstand*, as at EL §25, or in the remark to §28, or the addition to §35. And note that when Hegel is describing the “unruliness” of the animal world with respect to adequate conceptualization, he notes the “weakness of the Concept in nature” (*Diese Schwäche des Begriffs in der Natur* [EL §368]), a passage rightly cited by Bowman (149). This is a reference, in the view I will develop, to their unavailability for “full” intelligibility as what they are, in the Aristotelian sense. If that is what Bowman means by “metaphysical limitations inherent to natural objects as such,” I agree with him. (See 189, where Bowman defends the unavoidability of finite cognition, and its “unsublatable” necessity in absolute knowledge. This makes the “skepticism” characterization less apt, or more misleading, it seems to me.) That is, knowledge of the melting point of copper is knowledge, but presupposes a relation of qualitative and quantitative predicates and an exposition of natural kinds that a *Seinslogik*, given the definition of its domain, cannot account for without a transformation into a *Wesenslogik*. It is not the case that Hegel thinks that there is no “full” knowledge of the melting point of copper, only “full” knowledge of the Absolute. There is knowledge of the melting point of copper, but the presuppositions for such knowledge transcend the assumptions inherent in empirical observation, metals-science, etc. Likewise I think Longuenesse (2007) overstates the point when she characterizes Hegel’s intention by saying “his purpose is to dissolve their [scientific discourses’] claim to objective validity and this opens the space for speculative philosophy” (37–38). Speculative philosophy is the completion of scientific knowledge, not its competitor. Neither Bowman nor Longuenesse quotes the remark to EL §12, where Hegel not only says that the empirical sciences “prepare” their materials for philosophy “by finding universal determinations, genera and laws” but goes on to say that philosophy “owes its development to the empirical sciences, but it gives to their content the fully essential shape of freedom . . . as well as the validation [*Bewährung*] of necessity.” He says much the same “reconciliationist” thing (preserving and transforming, not dissolving or skeptically negating) in discussing the relation between philosophy and the empirical sciences in the addition to EL §9.

he calls “the Absolute.” This is a position that is supposed to serve the same function as the Platonic doctrine of Ideas, the Christian God, Descartes’s and Leibniz’s and Spinoza’s accounts of substance. We can say that for Hegel, the Absolute is the Concept, where he means conceptuality as such, not any particular concept but a concept among many. As we shall begin to see in the next chapter, and especially in the third, such conceptuality is apperceptive spontaneity, the principle, speaking loosely, by virtue of which anything is intelligible as what it is. Apperceptive spontaneity is not understood as a subjective mental activity, opposed to or addressed to or imposed on what there is. Properly understood, apperceptive spontaneity, the principle of intelligibility, just is the principle of the intelligibles. This means not that objects are self-conscious but that such an understanding of the Concept, once the self-determination of the “moments” of conceptuality itself, the products of apperceptive spontaneity, has been determined, is what objects conform to *in being the objects they are*. If we understand this properly, we understand apperceptive spontaneity “in its actuality,” as having “given itself” its own actuality, the actuality of the intelligibles, what there is. This is related to what Kant called establishing the objective validity of the categories, but Hegel insists that such an understanding of the relation between thought and being is established *within* the activity of pure thinking, not by appeal to anything extraconceptual, like the pure forms of intuition. (And the result is certainly not possible because thought creates its objects, its actuality, just by thinking them.) When thus conceived, the Concept is understood as, in Hegel’s terminology, the Idea.

Put in terms of the history of philosophy, what all of this will amount to is an attempt by Hegel at a highly unusual synthesis of the Kantian revolution in philosophy, especially the anti-empiricism, self-grounding character of reason (aka “the Concept”), and the most important Kantian innovation, the spontaneity of thinking, together with essential elements of Aristotle’s understanding of metaphysics, especially the Aristotelian notions of *energeia*, which Hegel translates as *Wirklichkeit*, actuality, the proper object of first philosophy, and, as we have already seen, the core of the classical view that “nous” rules the world, all in contrast to the rationalist metaphysics of nonsensible objects accessible to pure reason alone. Hegel is no metaphysician in this rationalist sense, but he is most certainly a metaphysician in the Aristotelian sense.⁵⁸ That is, at any rate, the thesis of the following book. I will

58. Cf. Kreines 2015 and 2017, and what he calls a “reason in the world” metaphysics. This could be given a more substantivist interpretation, as in Stern 2009, or the more Aristotelian or

begin in the next chapter by looking at how Hegel characterizes the relation between his *SL* and metaphysics, and by trying to clarify and defend the relevance of Aristotle just claimed.⁵⁹

An implication of this approach is perhaps the most distinctive of all of Hegel's philosophical claims about the results of the *SL*. At the highest level, the level Hegel aspires to reach, we are dealing with the most general a priori claims in ontology. Traditional examples would be that what is real are, say, ideal objects, Ideas, universals, imperfectly apprehensible in sensuous reality; or "what there is" are mere bare particulars, or bundles of universals, or only mental ideas which exist only when thought; or that all there is, is one infinite substance, neither mental nor physical; or infinitely many simple nonspatial substances, windowless, in no real relation to any other, and each expressive of the whole of the universe from its point of view; or "what there really is" is what the most advanced physical science is committed to. At a finer-grained level, we mean there are substances and properties, or events that cause each other, or bodies and minds, subjects and objects.

According to the traditional understanding of metaphysics, these are competitors. The truth of one excludes the possibility of the truth of others. This is especially the case with the claim that the possibility of there being, say, genuine subjects is incompatible with the ontology required for there to be objects. So either there are only subjects and states of subjects (or One Subject) or there are only objects and their properties and states (like events and states of affairs).

The most ambitious element of Hegel's view of his own results is simply that *these are not competitors*. Each can be properly understood only as a partial element in a logical totality. When we have understood their place in such a whole, we can understand why each can be said to be partially true but also false. This does not mean that there are Leibniz's monads and Spinoza's substance and Platonic ideas and Cartesian substances. The classical positions must be understood in their "logical" character, must be shown to express a necessary "determination," a *Denkbestimmung* of pure thinking, and so a result of thinking's own self-determination of intelligibility as such.

"energeia" reading that is proposed here. Kreines's account is good at showing why the "appeal to the concept" cannot be an appeal to anything substantive "underlying" the appearing world.

59. Mure (1940, 51) is certainly right to stress the importance of Aristotle, as also to claim that Hegel was the first philosopher to attempt a thorough reintroduction of Aristotle into modern philosophy, especially after the scorn heaped on him by the likes of Descartes and Hobbes. (Leibniz deserves a mention in this context, however.)

When they are so understood, their partiality as such logical moments and their complementarity can be properly understood. In so understanding such a comprehensive account, we have understood “the Absolute,” the Concept in its Actuality, or the Idea.⁶⁰ That is, that notion, the Absolute, does not introduce a new member of the metaphysical set of options introduced above as examples. It amounts to a retrospective understanding of the logic of, or the logical interrelation among, those “moments.” This is not to say that the “Absolute” perspective is philosophically informative. Its most important reconciliation of oppositions can be understood only from such a perspective, that between subject and object.⁶¹

The Plan

What follows is not a commentary on the *Logic*, a task that would probably take at least a lifetime. It is an interrogation of a single question, introduced in the next chapter: What does Hegel mean by claiming that “logic” has “taken the place of the old metaphysics,” and so that logic properly understood can be understood as a new metaphysics? In part 1, I discuss three thematic issues that I argue are indispensable in understanding that claim. In chapter 2, I discuss the identification claim itself (logic is “now” metaphysics), and so the general issue of Hegel’s understanding of the relation between the forms of thought and the forms of being. (In his discussion of the science of thinking and the forms of thinking, Hegel never means any old kind of thinking. He means, as Kant did, the forms of thought constitutive of, necessary for, forms of knowledge. For the German Idealists, “thinking,” at issue in a science, was judging, a claim to truth. The pure forms of thinking are the forms necessary for any judging to be so much as a putative form of knowledge, and so these forms of thinking are the forms of being, of objects. This does not mean that one can wave the magic wand of “to be is to be intelligible” over Kantian-like categories and insure their status as metaphysical. One must establish the proper status of pure thinking as such, the enormously complicated issue of the *Logic*’s “first moment” must be clarified, and one must defend the strong claim of internal necessity Hegel makes

60. Hence the famous claim that “the truth is the whole.” Contrary to claims like Adorno’s (“The whole is untruth”), Hegel’s position is far from a totalizing, individuality-denying monism. Understood as proposed, it is the most “pluralistic” in the history of philosophy.

61. There is an exemplary statement of this sort of approach to philosophical positions in Hegel’s account of Spinoza in the introductory materials to the logic of the Concept. Cf. 12.14

about the development of such concepts, none of which aspects involves any magic.) In chapter 3, I discuss the implications of Hegel's understanding of the Concept itself, his most general term for the basic bearer of truth, judgment, as apperceptive spontaneity. This will prove crucial in beginning to understand the logical "movement" that is distinctive of the work's progress through its various topics. In chapter 4, I discuss the manifold ways in which Hegel understands the speculative logic of negation, attempting to distinguish Hegel's core position from various misinterpretations and to show its role in the topic introduced in the previous chapter, logical "movement."

In part 2, I try to show how the general interpretation advanced in part 1 can make sense of the core issues (and admittedly, only those) in the three books of the *Logic*. Chapter 5 introduces the "logic of being" by an extended comparison with the problem of "givenness" in the *PhG*, arguing that that book is a "logical" version of Hegel's attack on immediacy and givenness in all its forms. Chapter 6 presents an interpretation of Hegel's logic, and so metaphysics, of essence—what for him the need for an essence-appearance distinction amounts to, the basic logical problem in making the distinction, and how Hegel addresses that issue. Chapter 7 addresses an assumption throughout the *Logic*: that thinking pure "thought-determinations" requires a "movement" of thought, as if there were a kind of conceptual life at work in the *Logic*. The proposal is to get clearer about this by examining an assumption Kant and Hegel share about the "purposive" nature of reason. Chapter 8 deals with one of the most counterintuitive implications of Hegel's identification of his logic with metaphysics, his attempt to show that "life" is not an empirical but a logical or pure concept. An implication of this is then presented in chapter 9: the identity of the Idea of the True and the Idea of the Good.

2

LOGIC AND METAPHYSICS

The system of logic is the realm of shadows, the world of simple essentialities, freed of all sensuous concretion. To study this science, to dwell and to labor in this realm of shadows, is the absolute culture and discipline of consciousness. (SL 21.42)

Forms of Thought and Forms of Being

Hegel frequently says something about a science of logic that is both extremely interesting and extremely controversial. A typical example is from paragraph 24 of the *Encyclopedia*. It is also a claim that lands one in the middle of a number of long-debated interpretive controversies.

Thus *logic* coincides with *metaphysics*, with the science of *things* grasped in *thoughts*, which used to be taken to express the *essentialities of the things*. (Die *Logik* fällt daher mit der *Metaphysik* zusammen, der Wissenschaft der *Dinge* in *Gedanken* gefaßt, welche dafür galten, die *Wesenheiten der Dinge* auszudrücken.) (Translation modified; all of these emphases are Hegel's.)

What he means by implying that logic can only *now* coincide with metaphysics, after we have somehow passed beyond the traditional metaphysical view that “thoughts” are to be considered the “essentialities of things,” is quite a compacted claim, to which we shall return. It is clear enough already that Hegel follows Kant’s innovation in his response to the empiricist challenge,

the first step in a long and complicated rejoinder to Hume and empiricism in general. The basic question is, How *could* there possibly be objectively valid concepts, true of all objects, but not derived from experience? Where could they come from? In Hegel's terms, this amounts to the question, How do concepts that are the products of thought alone "give themselves" content, where by content we mean something extraconceptual? Indeed, we mean to say something about the extraconceptual as such, being, the world. Then the beginning of an answer is that there *are* concepts, expressions of different conceptual powers, needed for thinking to be thinking at all. What else could it mean for Hegel to characterize logic, a science of pure thinking, as first philosophy? Accordingly, it shall be the goal of these first three chapters to explain that this means for Hegel, at the same time, to determine the other side of the same coin, to determine objects in their thinkability, where that means their suitability not for a finite, subjective power, but for *thought as such*, that is, objects in *their* intelligibility, in their being at all intelligibly *what they are*. Their being what they are *is* their concept, or their "being their concept," for Hegel. The concepts did not come from anywhere, any more than the thinking power comes from anywhere. Knowing this form is genuine philosophical knowledge, and would not be knowledge if the forms were not also the forms of objects. We are interested only in thinking beings (we and the empiricists alike), and thinking has its necessary conditions, the concepts, the conceptual powers, which constitute its possibility.

Now, this is a general picture of what was for Kant the great value in beginning reason's self-critique and his pursuit of objective synthetic a priori knowledge with an appeal to "logic," or "Pure General Logic," as a "clue" that will help establish a transcendental logic, a general picture we need to keep in mind to understand Hegel's appreciation of Kant's strategy and his own different use of it. Kant's own text in the "Metaphysical Deduction" is, however, much more complicated. T. Rosenkoetter,¹ following a suggestion by B. Longuenesse,² has argued that in establishing the Table of the Functions of Judgment, Kant is implicitly already making a distinction between a Pure General Logic, which is *wholly* formal (in no way considers content) and treats only the relation of thoughts to other thoughts, and a consideration that treats logic as the logic of judgment, where that means already considering that the function of judgment is relating our representations to

1. Rosenkoetter 2017.

2. Longuenesse 1998, 78; 2006, 144.

objects. (Rosenkoetter shows that this form of reflection does not violate Kant's norm for what properly constitutes transcendental logic, i.e., it does not introduce what constitutes the *specific* form of our access to content, spatio-temporal intuition.) It can be useful to think of Hegel's science of pure thinking as also classifiable neither as what Kant calls pure general logic, nor as transcendental logic (tied as it is to the pure forms of receptivity), but as a logic of the knowable as such, or a "logic of cognition" in Rosenkoetter's sense. I hope to make this clearer in what follows in this chapter.³

Moreover, it does not follow from the fact that logic coincides with metaphysics that all of metaphysics coincides with logic and only logic. Hegel's so-called *Realphilosophie*, his Philosophy of Nature and his Philosophy of Spirit, are also, properly considered, metaphysical projects.⁴ But there is first the large issue of the logic-metaphysics relation itself. What I propose to do is to say something about the historical context of logic in and after Kant, and present a few of the terms of art with which Hegel wants to explain the substance of the claim that logic is now metaphysics (section 1); speculate on what he might mean by "metaphysics" (section 2); delimit enough of what he means by logic to understand the substantive identification (section 3); and assess some of the implications of this way of looking at things for an interpretation of *The Science of Logic* as a whole.

We need to say something first about the historical context in which Hegel's §24 claim must be located. And that concerns the central issue introduced into theories of logic by Kant: the relation of concept to object. Then there is the question of Hegel's relation to that innovation.

The innovation is Kant's most famous and important, and concerns general logic understood as an a priori reflection on the relations of ideas. Kant's view is, of course, a critique of the claims made on behalf of that reflective activity, and the critique concerns the modern tradition stemming from Descartes, embodied in Arnauld's and Nicole's *Port Royal Logic* in 1662, as well as the Leibnizian/Wolffian metaphysical tradition. The former held that clarity

3. If Rosenkoetter is right, and he seems to me to have amassed a compelling body of evidence, that Kant considered "thought's content" in a way independent of transcendental logic's incorporation of *intuited* content, then that latter element seems even more "psychological," and the need for a "deduction" appears to arise only with this non-a priori addition. Both are Hegelian points. (At least they are in my view; I don't know Rosenkoetter's.)

4. See Koch 2014, 271. Koch is also right in this essay to remind us that Hegel also often uses the term "metaphysics" in a negative way. This happens when he means metaphysics as the attempt to deduce a priori the "most universal aspects of reality."

about the relations between ideas could lead the mind closer to the bearers of philosophical truth, clear and distinct ideas, known passively by “the light of reason.” For the latter, the laws of thought simply are the “laws of truth” (to use Frege’s phrase), or a general logic is just thereby a logic of objects, because all philosophical truth is what Kant would call “analytic,” arrived at by logical analysis alone. And since, under the impact of modern science, universals were no longer the “truly real” structural elements of the universe, relations of ideas no longer could be understood as mapping out relations in reality in that way. Mary Tiles summarizes it well. She says that Kant is insistent that

general logic cannot yield any knowledge [of objects], or any rules of the understanding pertaining to acquisition of knowledge of objects. A conceptual relation established on the basis of logical conceptual analysis may be empty because there are no objects falling under the concepts concerned. General logic can only establish logical possibilities and impossibilities. It provides only a negative touchstone of truth, avoidance of formal contradiction.⁵

And she further notes,

General logic is merely a logic of the relation of ideas, of the comparison of concepts. And the possible relations can be quickly exhausted: they are, inclusion, exclusion and overlap.⁶

So where should we place Hegel? In this, as in so many other respects, he is, I have already suggested, firmly in the post-Kantian world, something already indicated by his distancing himself in §24 from how metaphysics *had been* understood, as identifying thoughts with the “essentialities” of things. With general logic understood as it was in the Port Royal and the Wolffian traditions, he agrees that logical reasoning, *understood in that way*, does not provide knowledge of objects. He especially agrees with Kant that reason and the understanding are activities, not passively “illuminated.” As “that great foe of immediacy,” in Sellars’s phrase, he does not mention or rely on such receptive or noetic intuition. As such a great foe, Hegel is opposed to any notion of self-standing, atomic conceptual content. As he wants so famously

5. Tiles 2004, 92.

6. Tiles 2004, 92.

to show in a dialectical logic, determinateness is a function of determination, always an identification “through an other,” his formulation for discursivity.⁷ And the most comprehensive account we have of how Hegel wants us to understand two-thirds of his *Logic*, the “objective logic,” is: “What has been called objective logic here would correspond in part to what for him [Kant] is transcendental logic” (21.47). (As we shall see in detail, it is significant that Hegel also wrote Niethammer in 1812 that the objective logic roughly corresponds to Aristotle’s ontology. Strikingly, he understood that ontology to be presented in the *Organon*, Aristotle’s six works on logic [*L*, 277].)⁸ Admittedly, he is not always as clear as he might be about this. In the history of philosophy lectures, he also notes a fundamental “Nachteil,” deficiency or disadvantage of Aristotle’s logic, that the bearing of logic on ontology is not clear to Aristotle, and that in his treatment, “forms” are treated too “formally”: “Its failure [this treatment of form] is not that they are only forms, but that [the notion of true] form is lacking [*sondern Form fehlt*]” (*W* 19: 239).

Just a brief glance at the *Logic* indicates a general structure that helps explain such a claim about Kant. The logic of being seems clearly to correspond to the Kantian categories of quality and quantity, what Kant called the mathematical and constitutive categories, and the logic of essence certainly seems to correspond to the categories of relation and modality, or the dynamical and regulative categories. The logic of the Concept makes use of the same syllogistic central to Kant’s conception of the role of such an inferential structure in the activity of reason, the third major part of the *Critique*, but Hegel, often discussing issues that Kant would consider part of general logic, treats such a topic as a culmination. And then Hegel puts the main point he wants to make, in agreeing with Kant about transcendental logic, as clearly as it can be put:

The objective logic thus takes the place rather of the former metaphysics which was supposed to be the scientific edifice of the world as constructed by thoughts alone. (21.48)⁹

7. This is shown in Theunissen’s (1980, 100–104) brilliant defense of Hegel against Tugendhat’s criticism, to wit, that Hegel is making these very points against an “intuitive” model of the understanding in the passages Tugendhat is taking Hegel to task for.

8. He also mentions in this letter that for him “metaphysics in any case falls entirely within logic,” and he says he “can cite Kant as my precedent and authority” (*L*, 277).

9. It is not true that, as Düsing (2011, 104) claims, Hegel really means to call for “modifications which he sees as improvements” in this metaphysics. That is not in the text. What is in the text is “take the place of” (*tritt ... an die Stelle*) (di Giovanni translates *wissenschaftliche Gebäude*

As we shall see, Hegel does not understand transcendental logic, and so the “problem of objects,” in the same way as Kant, but it is important to note how Hegel states his allegiances. I take these passages and others I will cite below to indicate that Hegel accepts Kant’s critique of rationalist metaphysics and wants to fold it into his own account; that he accepts that there is no way that a determination of the logically possible (the mere avoidance of contradiction) can contribute to any knowledge about what is the case, and that this was the cardinal error of modern rationalism. This is not to say that Hegel thinks there is no metaphysical import to a reconceived transcendental logic, as we shall see. But there is no question that Hegel both wholeheartedly agreed with Kant’s critique of substantive metaphysics, and realized that that critique applied only to modern metaphysics and left several possibilities open. When discussing Kant’s critique of rationalist psychology as paradigmatic for the critique of metaphysics, he notes,

What Kant generally has in mind here is the state of the metaphysics of his time which, as a rule, stayed at these one-sided determinations with no hint of dialectic; he neither paid attention to, nor examined, the genuinely speculative ideas of older philosophers on the concept of spirit. (12.194)¹⁰

Finally, for both Kant and Hegel, the unit of significance for any logic is not the proposition or any static formal structure but acts of reasoning and assertion, and so the logic that is a model for both transcendental logic and Hegelian science is still judgmental, raising as an inevitable question the status of “subjectivity” in logic, the issue that bothered Frege. Or, said more precisely, Hegel’s logic does not primarily concern relations among, operations upon, propositions, and is instead oriented from a logic of terms. So we don’t see a syntax specified by axioms, a proof theory, and a semantics. Conceptual relations among basic concepts, moments of “the Concept,”

über die Welt as “scientific edifice of the world,” but more of a sense of Hegel’s dissatisfactions with it could be given by stronger translation of *über*, “superimposed upon the world.” See Mure 1950, 89. Martin (2012), in a very valuable study, is right to emphasize that Hegel’s project in the *Logic* should be called a “critical ontology,” on the Kantian understanding of critical. See Martin (2012, 1–23) and *SL* 21.48–49.

10. A page later, Hegel makes clear that at least one of those older philosophers is Aristotle and refers to his “truly speculative ideas” about thinking (12.195). The claim I want to make is that this is an *extremely* valuable clue.

make up the content, like the relations between the concepts of finitude and infinity, one and many, essence and appearance, substance and attribute, being and essence. But as becomes clearer in the logic of the Concept, conceptual content is not provided by analysis of atomistically conceived concepts. Concepts are understood, as they were in Kant, as “predicates of possible judgments,” and the roles they play in possible judgments in various contexts, involving other concepts, and the roles they can and cannot play in such judgments (including the inferential relations among the judgments) are necessary to specify such concepts. This is why Hegel metaphorically speaks of concepts as alive, in movement, and why the logic’s “motion” is the key to the specification of any concept (that is, any concept understood as a necessary moment in the Concept, the concepts necessary for anything at all to be determined).¹¹ Concepts are rules for judgmental unification, and judgmental unification is always apperceptive. (Judging and the consciousness of judging are not two acts but one.) So the structure of concepts in use is the structure of the apperceptive “I.” (As we shall see in chapter 3, being’s intelligibility as “reflected being,” its division into essence and appearance, being’s being and not being its appearances, is the objective correlate of the I’s self-relation.)¹² The concept of the Concept, the apperceptive understanding of the implications of this apperceptive structure, is what Hegel calls “the Absolute.”

Here then is a typical account by Hegel of the subject matter of *The Science of Logic*. Hegel tells us only that the work concerns “the science of pure thinking” (*Wissenschaft des reinen Denkens*), and he goes on in that passage to say that it is

the science that has pure knowledge for its principle and is a unity which is not abstract but living and concrete, so that the opposition of consciousness between a being subjectively existing for itself, and another but objectively existing such being, has been overcome in it, and being is known to be in itself a pure concept and the pure concept to be true being. These, then, are the two moments contained in logic. But they are now known to exist inseparably, not as in consciousness, where each exists for itself; it

11. See the useful and clear account by deVries 1993.

12. So, it is not the case that Hegel wants to say that the intelligibility of an object depends on, is an independent function of, a subject’s apperceptive unity. The subject-object relation is one of identification, not dependence.

is for this reason and this reason alone, because they are at the same time known to be distinct [*unterschiedene*] (yet not to exist for themselves), that their unity is not abstract, dead and inert, but concrete. (21.45)¹³

Everything distinctive about Hegel's approach is contained in that paragraph, so we should proceed slowly, especially with respect to its key claim, which comes in two parts: (i) first, a double claim of identity—that being is itself a pure concept, and such a pure concept is being. That would certainly establish a relationship between logic and metaphysics: one of identity. Yet this is supposed to be so even as (ii) he warns us that this identity is of quite a special sort, one paradoxically compatible with their continuing *distinctness*.¹⁴

There is a form of this sort of claim of identity in John McDowell's *Mind and World* that can be helpful here. This is so because in McDowell's view we can certainly distinguish thinking from what is thought (the world is not a

13. He is recapitulating here what he said a few pages earlier about the accomplishment of the *PhG*:

In the *Phenomenology of Spirit* I have presented consciousness as it progresses from the first immediate opposition of itself and the subject matter [*Gegenstand*] to absolute knowledge. This path traverses all the forms of the relation of consciousness to the object and its result is the concept of science. There is no need, therefore, to justify this concept here (apart from the fact that it emerges within logic itself). It has already been justified in the other work, and would indeed not be capable of any other justification than is produced by consciousness as all its shapes dissolve into that concept as into their truth. (21.32)

And even more importantly:

The concept of pure science and its deduction is therefore presupposed in the present work in so far as the *Phenomenology of Spirit* is nothing other than that deduction. Absolute knowledge is the truth of all the modes of consciousness because, as the course of the *Phenomenology* brought out, it is only in absolute knowledge that the separation of the subject matter from the certainty of itself is completely resolved: truth has become equal to certainty and this certainty to truth. (21.33)

Absolute knowledge, on the interpretation defended here, is pure thinking's knowledge of what pure thinking is, what its "moments" are, and its status, just thereby, as "metaphysics."

14. So when Bowman (2013) summarizes what he calls Hegel's "critical metaphysics" as committed to there being "no ultimate difference in kind between the activities of knowing and the being of what is known" (14), "ultimate" has to be unpacked carefully lest we ignore what Hegel says about this "difference." For one thing, obviously neither Hegel (nor Bowman) means that the act of asserting a proposition at some temporal moment is "all that there is" in the world. For another, Hegel is telling us in the passage quoted that we need this *unterschiedene* to understand why his logic is "concrete" and "alive." "No ultimate difference" would go too far unless we have a sufficient gloss on "ultimate." (Such a gloss begins in Bowman's account when he introduces his version of "formal" and "objective" reality to account for a difference he then promises to show is also an identity, 18ff.)

thought-thing; thinking is a discursive activity; the world is not a discursive activity) and still insist that the world “is made up of the sort of things one can think.”¹⁵ (That discursive activity is, in its unity, the unity of anything that can be known would be expressed on the “object side” by claiming that a determinate object is articulable as a single unity.) Or, for example, the profound-sounding (even Heideggerian) claim that there is no ontological gap between thought and world just comes down to the fact that “one can think, for instance, *that spring has begun*, and that very same thing, *that spring has begun*, can be the case.”¹⁶ What I think when I know (think truly) that something is the case is simply what is the case. It is thus a truism of sorts that, with the issue posed in a Kantian way, “the forms of thought *are* the forms of things.” This will have a Kantian spin if we note that “the form of things” for Kant is relativized to the forms of intuition, space and time, and that route requires a qualification, that the forms are “only subjective.” This seems to take back with one hand (the *subjective* forms) what was given with the other (the form of the extraconceptual, the form of *things*). This is, quite rightly by my lights, how McDowell wants to treat the preferability of Hegel’s over against Kant’s (official or received) form of idealism. The distinction between “conditions on the possibility of knowledge of things” and “conditions on the possibility of things themselves,” which some use to characterize Kant’s idealism, should be rejected “on the ground that the relevant conditions are inseparably both conditions on thought and conditions on objects, not primarily either the one or the other.”¹⁷

The difficult issues concern not what I know when I know what is the case, but how I can be in a position to know what is the case, either empirically (because I have seen the signs of spring) or, especially, when the claim is specific, a particular “condition” known a priori, e.g., that every event has a cause. (We could also say that while this must be what it is to think what is the case, we have not thereby explained how it is possible to do so. For Hegel, we can explain it only by explaining the identity and difference of thinking and being, a point he will address in the “determinations of reflection.”) This is the kind of realism Hegel espouses (and Husserl at his core, apart from his Cartesian animadversions).¹⁸ Here is Hegel’s formulation.

15. McDowell 1996, 27–28.

16. McDowell 1996, 27.

17. McDowell 2009, 153.

18. This is why Redding (2007, 232) can characterize Hegel’s position in the “Proclean” way he does. I agree with him that the notion of negation in Hegel (and, I would say, its links with the

The older metaphysics had in this respect a higher concept of thinking than now passes as the accepted opinion. For it presupposed as its principle that only what is known of things and in things by thought is really true [*wahrhaft Wahre*] in them, that is, what is known in them not in their immediacy but as first elevated to the form of thinking, as things of thought. This metaphysics thus held that thinking and the determination of thinking are not something alien to the subject matters, but are rather their essence, or that the things and the thinking of them agree in and for themselves (also our language expresses a kinship between them); that thinking in its immanent determinations, and the true nature of things, are one and the same content. (SL 21.29)

It will be important (for Hegel, at any rate), as we shall see shortly, that this account of an “identity” (“one and the same content”) is true of philosophical or speculative thinking, thinking that has as its subject matter “true being” or “actuality.” Hence the identity within difference of being and thinking, the core principle of Hegel’s version of rationalism.¹⁹ In other words, there is an “identity” between “pure thinking’s moments” (suitably well defined) and “any possible object of pure thinking,” or pure thinking’s “truth.” It is an identity within difference because the speculative claim does not mean that the world, what seems other than thinkings, must nevertheless be “*thinkings*.” It does not, any more than true thoughts (judgments) are true by virtue of the world’s being *thoughts*. Once we understand the necessary dependence of any true thinking about anything on pure thinking, and once we understand what constitutes pure thinking (especially its “spontaneity”), and once we understand the “moments” necessary for pure thinking to be pure thinking, we have established thereby the truth about what there is. (The necessity of these moments in knowing anything at all is crucial to the case; showing their necessity, and defending the presuppositionlessness of beginning with the knowability of anything at all, is in effect the Hegelian “deduction,” what replaces Kant’s appeal to the subjective forms of intuition.)

doctrine of apperception) prohibits enlisting the *Logic* in Paul Franks’s (2005) characterization of Spinozistic “holistic monism.” See especially Redding’s (232n.40) remarks about determination and negation.

19. See this formulation from the *PhG*.

Now, this category, that is, the simple unity of self-consciousness and being, has the distinction in itself, for its essence is precisely this, that it is immediately selfsame in otherness, that is, immediately selfsame in the absolute distinction. Thus, the distinction exists, but it exists as completely transparent distinction which is at the same time therefore no distinction at all. (§235)

In fact, McDowell's remarks can be taken to be a useful gloss on Hegel's well-known remarks in the introduction of the *Phenomenology of Spirit* that we should not draw a "sharp line [*schlechthin scheidende Grenze*] separating cognition from the Absolute" (*PhG* §73). If we do, we shall be tempted to think of what we know when we know something as some "intermediary" or mental representation or abstract object (proposition), and not what is the case. And just as in McDowell's insistence, we can be misled by taking our bearings at the outset from knowledge claims that are in fact false. Here is Hegel's version of exactly that warning.²⁰

Meanwhile, if the anxiety about falling into error sets up a mistrust of science, which itself is untroubled by those scruples and simply sets itself to its work and actually gets down to cognizing, then it is difficult to see why there should not be instead a mistrust of this mistrust, that is, why there should not be an anxiety over whether the fear of error is not already the error itself. (*PhG* §74)²¹

There have been several objections to what is taken to be this "conflation" (aka "identification") of "proposition and fact," and these perfectly parallel the same sorts of criticism of Hegel, by E. Tugendhat,²² for one. W. Künne, for example, has cited several of these objections to what he and others call, in a Hegelian phrase, the "identity" theory of truth ("*Idem*").²³ He himself is convinced by the consideration that we individuate facts less finely than true propositions. (The fact that you never met Cassius Clay is the same as the fact that you never met Muhammad Ali, but the propositions are different.)²⁴ But the issue is not any sort of general identification of proposition and facts (as if McDowell must believe that the world is made up of propositions). The right account of the semantic content of the assertion is not at issue: our bearings are taken first by attention to what one knows when one actually

20. For a fuller exploration of this position, see the discussion in Hornsby 1997 and Dodd 2000.

21. See also Brandom's (2011, I) account of the move in Kant and then Hegel away from representation (modern) and resemblance (ancient) theories. Brandom's version of the topic under discussion is that we cannot have a semantics that dooms our epistemology to skepticism. For Brandom (2011, 8), Hegel learned from Kant that the "soft underbelly" of modern epistemology is its problematic semantics. Another version of the same point: Frege's dictum that a fact is a thought that is true. We will return to this idea later. See Ludlow 1997, 27.

22. Tugendhat 1986.

23. Künne 2003, 6–12.

24. Künne 2003, 11.

knows, and in this case it is the absence of some event in the world—my never having met a certain person. And more importantly, the propositional move inevitably commits us to saying that *what* one knows in knowing is, of a proposition, that it is true. But that is not what one knows. One knows of *spring* that it has begun.²⁵ And what is of interest to Hegel, complicating matters, is the sense in which the “Concept” is *not* “being in and for itself,” as well as “*is*.” (Again, he does not claim to identify the world with judgments about it.) Moreover, empirical knowledge (“spring has sprung”) is not fully self-conscious knowledge, is possible under unacknowledged presuppositions, and so the “completion” of knowledge will ultimately turn out to be the Concept’s relation to itself, the Concept of the Concept, and therewith “complete” identity.²⁶ It will take a while—the rest of the book in fact—to formulate an interpretation of just what this means. Therein lies the whole tale, but the “difference” between Concept and “being in and for itself” is not of the sort that would reinstitute a skeptical problem.²⁷

Hegel’s formulations of this point can be somewhat startlingly blunt. In EL §167, in differentiating a judgment, as considered by logic, from any psychological treatment, he says,

every thing is a judgment [*alle Dinge sind ein Urteil*].²⁸—That is, every thing is a singular [*Einzelnes*] which is inwardly a universality [*Allgemeinheit*] or

25. One could say that in knowing one’s beliefs to be true, one just knows what is the case. But there is some sense in which knowing something about one’s beliefs is knowing something about oneself, not what is the case. This general point *is* of relevance to Heidegger. In order to know, of a proposition, that it is true, to verify it, in the “correspondence” theory of truth, for example, one would have to know what is the case. So why not skip this long way around the barn and just say (or “uncover” or “reveal”) *that*?

26. For the bearing of this sort of identity theory on empirical knowledge, and the limitations of such empirical knowledge even so understood, see *PhG* §238.

27. So while Stern (2009, 77–79) is right to insist on a distinction in Hegel between propositional truth or correctness (I say “there is a carriage passing by” as one passes by) and “material” or ontological truth (Jordan is a *true* basketball player), there is also what Hegel calls “speculative” truth, the truth of the statements in the *Logic*, for example, as at EL §236. Those truths do not simply “allow being to disclose itself” in some Heideggerian sense; they compose the content of speculative judgments, which say of what is that it is, as it is, not as in the first example, through correspondence, but through identity. The notion at the heart of speculative truth is the concept “agreeing with itself,” which ultimately means the reflective recollection of the necessary moments of the Concept as conceptuality itself, true intelligibility. See the helpful account in Longuenesse 2007, 24–27.

28. The unusual grammar of “*sind ein Urteil*” is clearly meant to prevent us from taking the claim to mean that things are judgments, that all there is are judgments. Things are judgmental

inner nature, in other words a universal that is made singular; universality and singularity distinguish themselves within it, but at the same time they are identical.

A thing, in its determinate intelligibility, has a judgmental structure, a “singularized universal,” about which of course much more has to be said. This is an analogue of his understanding of concepts as, following Kant, synthetic unities, functions in judgments. Hegel is very clear that we should not think of concepts or universals as special sorts of individuated things. They are moments of an activity, which activity is being treated logically (normatively), not psychologically (factually). This is what makes it possible that the world “is made up of the sort of thing one can think.” And, again, considering a thing in terms of its intelligibility is nothing like a *restriction* to what “we could make sense of.” Unintelligible things (trivially the same notion as “things that we can render intelligible”) can be contemplated in the way an unintelligible logic can be contemplated: as an impossibility.²⁹

There are two other implications of this approach for Hegel’s canonical formulations of his position, and we will encounter them frequently. If “truth” does not involve knowing of a proposition that it corresponds to reality, then correspondence is not the issue at all. As noted, the epistemological question is still a serious one: *how* could we come to be in the position to know what is the case and assert it, in both observational and “logical” contexts? What happens when we go wrong? But we are already headed in a direction that starts to line up with Hegel’s position. For his frequent formulation is that, at bottom, speculative truth, Hegel’s concern in the *SL*, is a matter not of thought’s correspondence with reality, but of “thought’s agreement with itself.” The position just described leaves open the possibility that *the categorical form* of any claim to truth is not derived or observed, but a matter of “thought’s self-determination,” and in that sense a matter of thought’s agreeing with itself. In nonspeculative contexts, this means that,

in form, “judgment shaped objects,” to paraphrase Strawson on facts as “proposition shaped objects.” For Aristotle’s (preliminary) puzzlement about a very similar issue, see *De Anima* 429b22ff.

29. EL §168 goes on to note the Hegelian sense of finitude. That limitation concerns the limited intelligibility of the unity of the logical concepts needed to express the finite thing’s determinacy: universal and “existence” (*Dasein*), even though united, are already “different” (*verschieden*) and “separable” (*trennbar*). This logical sense of the “idealism of the finite,” and not any appeal to a substantive degree of reality theory, is consistent throughout Hegel’s formulations.

in a genuine judgment (not a mere proposition, a distinction we still have to set out), a thing agrees more or less with, better or worse exemplifies, its concept. “That is a good house.” “That action is wrong.”³⁰ At the speculative level, either a putative concept (“essence”) agrees with, exemplifies, what it is supposed to be as such a concept, a principle of intelligibility that accounts for determinateness, or it falls short and must be reformulated. This is generally true of philosophical claims of any substance and involves the way in which the authority of reason must be self-authorizing. The binding force of such a thinking, a judgment (a taking to be true), is thought itself. In a judgment like “Humans are political animals,” the world is not impressing itself on us, making adherence to such a truth unavoidable, creating a kind of force we cannot resist. The force of a judgment is judgment’s own force; it is not a natural force or the result of the accumulation of empirical data.³¹

Everything, of course, depends on how the notion of categorically self-determining development of the notion of conceptuality itself is explained, first in Kant and then in Hegel, for the task of the *Logic* depends on its correct articulation. (That thought could be said to “require something of itself,” that intelligible thought requires a unity of self-consciousness that could never “come to us” through the senses, is the *nervus probandi* of Kant’s deduction, and the argument form plays a role in Hegel as well.) And in empirical cases, cognition, if it is cognition, thereby excludes everything inconsistent with the claim. Thought’s “agreeing with itself”—excluding inconsistencies and accepting implications—is what constitutes the claim as cognition. What can be said to alert us that our assertion has misfired is not anything like the brute recalcitrance of reality to being so described, our assertion not “fitting” it, but what else we know about what is the case that is inconsistent with what we claim. Thought is not agreeing with itself.

Such an insistence on distinctness in the 21.45 quotation above at least makes it immediately clear that Hegel cannot be saying (any more than McDowell is saying) that *what there is* is an abstract, immaterial entity or entities, in the way a realist might understand universals, or an idea-monist

30. As we shall see, this last question, whether a concept agrees with itself, or whether an instance of the concept fully corresponds to its concept, represents something like the “highest” degree of possible intelligibility. “It is only when things are studied from the point of view of their kind [*Gattung*], and as with necessity determined by the kind, that the judgment first begins to be a true [*wahrhaft*] judgment” (EL §177Z). This latter point of view is then again connected with “a comparison of the objects with what they ought to be; i.e. with their concept [*Begriff*]” (EL §171).

31. “I did it because I thought I ought to” could be appealed to to make the same point.

or a pantheist would understand everything, or a Platonist might understand ideas. It is confusion on this point that renders most conventional summaries of Hegel's position so immediately problematic. Then there would just or only *be* such universals or ideas, or mind, really or in truth; there would be no continuing "distinctness," nothing "*unterschiedene*."³² Any claim of a mind thinking such a thought would have to be a manifestation of such being, which immediately undermines the notion of a mind thinking such a thought.

An earlier specification of this identity in the introduction gives us a deeper clue about how to proceed and raises a theme that is interwoven everywhere in the *Logic*, but that, I would claim, still has not been successfully interpreted. The passage involves a much more Hegelian specification of what he meant by "being" in that "being-concept" identity claim:

*As science, truth is pure self-consciousness as it develops itself and has the shape of the self, so that that which exists in and for itself is the known [gewußte] concept and the concept as such is that which exists in and for itself. (21.33, my emphasis)*³³

"That which exists in and for itself" obviously introduces many more complications than reference to mere "being." What could it be for something to exist "for itself"? Why is it identical to the "known, *gewußte*, concept"? And what does he mean by adding that "known" to the "concept"? (Why not just say identical to the concept, as he would if he were a concept realist?)

32. Likewise, in the opening paragraph of the logic of being in the EL, when Hegel says the concept's reflective self-determination is "the going into itself of being, its own deepening into itself" (§85), he means to insist again that ontology is now logic, not that logic should now be understood as what *was* ontology, an ontology of being somehow boring into itself. The ontological meaning of logic was how the Wolffians thought about "logic," and Hegel is not Wolff. We need to remember that the subject matter of the *Logic* is *Wirklichkeit*, being in its truth, in terms of its possible intelligibility, and so that he is here waving off a Kantian understanding of subjective imposition of categorical form, and insisting that the Concept's self-determination counts as what could be its objects. Otherwise we have Hegel inviting us to watch *being* think about, go into, itself; this is not at all an uncommon reading, but I have never been able to make much sense out of it.

33. There are passages like this from the Philosophy of Spirit: *was gedacht ist, ist; und daß, was ist, nur ist, insofern es Gedanke ist* (PS §465). But it is clear that by this point in the *Encyclopedia*, Hegel is not talking about what merely exists, and suddenly turning into Bishop Berkeley by claiming *esse est percipi*. What a thing truly is is its concept, and a concept is not a self-standing "thought" but a moment in a network of mutually interdefining rules of determination. See note 37 on *Wirklichkeit*.

The situation is immediately quite complicated. To some extent, part of Hegel's debt to Aristotle emerges here.³⁴ In his lectures on Aristotle, Hegel aligns himself with the goal of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, as the "science of that which is insofar as it is and what belongs to it in and for itself."³⁵ Entities are the determinate entities they are "in terms of" or "because of" their concept or substantial form. Such a form accounts for such determinacy. As Aristotle puts it in a canonical formulation from *Metaphysics Z*:

And since the existence of the thing must already be given, it is clear that the question must be *why the matter is so-and-so*. For instance, the question may be 'Why are these things here a house?' (And the answer is 'Because what being is for a house belongs to them'), or it may be 'Why is this thing here a man?,' or 'Why is this body in this state a man?' So what is sought is the *cause by which the matter is so-and-so, i.e. the form*. And that is the substance. (1041b3–8, my emphasis)³⁶

Such entities embody some measure of what it is truly to be *such* a thing and instantiate such a "why the matter is so-and-so" to a greater or lesser degree. A wolf is not simply, in itself, what it is to be a wolf but to some degree or other a better or worse exemplification of such a concept "for itself." The object is not just "as it is"; it is "for" (here, in the sense of "for the sake of") its concept and hereby itself. (A merely "existing" wolf is thus not an "actual" wolf. The latter would involve truly being for itself, the realization of wolf-ness. Hegel will tell us later that the subject matter of the *SL* is "actuality," not existence, and will mean something similar.)³⁷ This is all in keeping with Hegel's general tendency to gloss his use of for-itself with Aristotle's notion

34. Redding (2007) has noted the oddity of Hegel's using Aristotle's realism "to counter Kantian subjectivism" (222), even while still being indebted to Kant. Redding's general formulation states the (apparently) paradoxical position in all its glory. With respect to the relation of categories to being:

The categories, or thought determinations, do not reflect an independent determinate realm of objects, but nor do objects reflect an independently structured realm of determinations of thought. Rather we must be able *somehow* to think of these two realms as *one*. (Ibid.)

See also the apt formulation on p. 232. I think we need to go deeper into Kant to find the Hegelian position on logic than Redding intimates, and to say more about what one means by "being," but I agree with this formulation.

35. *LHP* 137. Aristotle 1994a, 1003a21–22. See also Ferrarin 2007, 105.

36. Aristotle 1994a.

37. The unity of concept and *Realität* is what Hegel means by *Wirklichkeit*, actuality. See EL §215 and, for its bearing on the famous *Doppelsatz* in the *Philosophy of Right*, see EL §6. See also EL §121A on the "ground" of the plant's growth being ultimately "nothing but the concept of the plant itself."

of an actualized potential, an *energeia*, *actus*, or in Hegel *Wirklichkeit*, and in-itself as *dynamis*, *potentia*, or, in Hegel, *Möglichkeit*.³⁸ To say that an object is “for its form” is just to say that there is an intelligible dynamic in its development. (As in Aristotle, the particular kind of unity by which any thing or process or activity is what it distinctly is *is* the unity by virtue of which it is intelligible.)³⁹ Various aspects or elements or moments make sense in terms of the concept of the thing. This intelligible dynamic is its concept and is not something that exists separate from or supervening on some physical attributes and efficient causation. It just is the intelligible way a development develops; there is nothing “over and above” the development.⁴⁰

A full statement of Hegel’s debt to Aristotle, especially with respect to the crucial terms of his project, is given in the *Encyclopedia*.

More precisely, therefore, Aristotle’s polemic against Plato consists in his designation of the Platonic idea as mere *δύναμις*, and in urging, on the contrary, that the Idea, which is recognized by both of them equally to be alone what is true, should be regarded essentially as *ἐνέργεια*, i.e. the inwardness that is totally to the fore, so that it is the unity of inward and outward. In other words the Idea should be regarded as actuality in the emphatic sense that we have given it here. [*d. h. als das Innere, welches schlechthin heraus ist, somit als die Einheit des Inneren und Äußeren oder als die Wirklichkeit in dem hier besprochenen emphatischen Sinne des Wortes zu betrachten sei.*] (§142Z)⁴¹

38. For the relevant passage and a longer discussion see Kern’s (1971) invaluable article. See as well Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* 1028b2–4, where the question at issue, the question of being, is the question not of existence, but of what substance is, what it is to be substance. Hegel too will insist on a distinction between questions of existence and questions of *Wirklichkeit*. See EL §5. Moreover, it would be correct to say of Hegel’s *Logic* what it is true to say of Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*: that the inquiry is not about kinds of being but about modes of being; not about entities but about the being of entities. See 1025b6–18. See Kosman’s (2013, 120ff.) explanation. Likewise the “moments” of Hegel’s Concept classify kinds of predicative being, not kinds of entities, in a way similar to Aristotle’s categories.

39. Cf. Michael Thompson 2008, 11, *inter alia*. See especially, “I think our question should not be: What is a life-form, a species, a *psyche*, but: How is such a thing described?” (62).

40. See Lear (1988, 41–42) on Aristotle.

41. Cf. also:

But if the truth of the matter is as was already stated and is otherwise generally admitted, that the *nature*, the specific *essence*, that which is truly *permanent* and *substantial* in the manifold and accidentality of appearance and fleeting externalization, is the *concept* of the thing, the *universal which is present in it* . . . (21.15)

It is a great although not uncommon error to think Hegel is referring here to an abstract entity with a causal power to make the thing be and make it, sustain it as, what it is. See the discussion in chapter 8.

To some extent, though, the “for itself” term has its proper home in Hegel’s logic of being (where there is a section discussing the notion), and that has something to do, Hegel explains, with what the term colloquially sounds like, as when I say, “I’m in this for myself” (SL 21.145).⁴² In more logical terms, it concerns a certain putative idea of an internally determined identity of some conceptual content, “for itself,” rather than its being what it is by its being determined by its relation with others, by being for others. (This separation or strict duality between a determinacy wholly for itself and one “for an other” will turn out to be a false opposition in the logic of being. In fact it is the main point of such a logic of being to demonstrate just that — the complementarity rather than opposition of such notions.)

Even though this is so (that “for itself” and “for an other” will be reciprocally dependent notions), the general notion of a being in and for itself has introduced the idea of being as determinate and intelligible being. It is what it is and not anything else (it is “in itself”), but only by virtue of the properties that can intelligibly distinguish it from its contraries (can determine what it is “for itself”). Its determinacy is a matter of both a plurality and a unity of determinations, or thought-determinations, or predicates or concepts.⁴³

But of course ordinary beings do not assert themselves for themselves, *claim* to be for themselves what they are, so Hegel quickly turns to modes of thought’s determining such determinacy. (Hegel does not add “known,” *gewußte*, to concept arbitrarily. As he keeps insisting, a concept is a “thought-determination,” and that “determination” is the result of some act of determining, or predication.)⁴⁴ Accordingly, everything, I want to suggest, turns on the sweeping claim that “*truth* [the truth of being, the determination of

42. Indeed, in EL §96A, Hegel notes that “the most familiar example of being-for-itself is the I.” In general, Hegel undertakes to show that the dialectic that emerges from this for-itself and for-another occasions a more comprehensive reflection about how this duality is possible, resulting in its reconception as “the one” and “the many,” a level of abstraction on the verge of the treatment of things “quantitatively,” in which differing determinations do not change the determination of what the thing is.

43. As it is standardly understood, universals unify by grouping together particulars, instances of the same kind; particulars or logical subjects unify the multiple concepts they instantiate. See Tiles 2004, 111.

44. In his Lectures on Aristotle, Hegel comments on Aristotle but is speaking for himself when he says:

Aristotle thinks of objects, and because these are thought as thoughts [*Gedanken*], they are thought in their truth; that [thought] is their *ousia*. This doesn’t mean that the objects of nature are themselves thinking. The objects are thought subjectively by me; for my thought is also the concept of the thing, and this [the concept] is the substance of the thing. (GW 19: 164)

what things truly are] is *self-consciousness* [the forms of self-conscious judgment].”⁴⁵ That is, an object (an empirical object, a domain of some kind of objects, an event, a relation between events, a possibility, a value) makes sense as existing *in and for itself* within what Hegel calls “the science of things in thought,” or the “science of pure thinking.” In that sense, it is to be considered as it is (in itself, in its determinate way of being) *but therewith also in its intelligibility*, in the light of its sufficient reason to be as it is, the modality of its determinate intelligibility. And it is intelligible only as conceived, as rendered intelligible, by thought. This does not claim it exists only as conceived, or that the conceiving on which its determinacy depends should be understood as subjective mental episodes. And we have already seen how Hegel wants to differentiate his understanding from how a Leibnizian would understand such an appeal to sufficient reason. At this point, all we know about his own approach is that he does not think we are left with just General Logic, as understood by Kant or Frege, and empirical acquisition of knowledge. What else? is the main question. Thought can determine its objects, but not by appeal to the light of reason, not “immediately.” We recall: two-thirds of the *Logic* corresponds to Kant’s transcendental Logic and is the successor to pre-Kantian metaphysics. Much more will have to be said about this, but it will be very important to Hegel that to consider things in their intelligibility is also and at the same time to consider them in terms of the only beings for whom beings can be intelligible, rational beings. (The question of their intelligibility does not make sense otherwise.) And rational intelligibility is self-conscious intelligibility, discursive mental acts of such rendering intelligible, undertaken as such. A similar form of reasoning can be found in Frege: a language *cannot* contain a representation of objects, unless it also contains predicative expressions. This also means that an intellect cannot have the power of apprehending objects unless it has the power of thinking something *of them*, of apprehending Fregean concepts.⁴⁶ This is already a metaphysics — of objects and concepts. Frege will add relations and, down the line, numbers.

One could say something similar about Kant (although he would not): that *S-is-P* form already embodies a metaphysics, requires a distinction between substances and properties, entities that could be subject to that

45. “Oder der Begriff der Wahrheit ist, daß die Wahrheit das reine Selbstbewußtsein sey . . .” (11.21) (in the simpler formulation from the first edition of the *SL*).

46. These are Michael Thompson’s (2008, 56–57) formulations.

form. This is certainly true for Hegel of traditional syllogism. “All men are mortal; Socrates is a man; therefore Socrates is mortal” expresses the relation between universality, individuality, and particularity, a metaphysical commitment about distinctions necessary for the world to be an intelligible world, a world that could make *any* sense, not “sense for us.”

This position is not easy to state clearly, mostly because orienting oneself in Hegel from a broadly Kantian perspective can seem to many, understandably, to require positions Hegel explicitly rejects, like any distinction between things considered in terms of their possible intelligibility and things considered simply as they are in themselves. For numerous reasons we shall confront, Hegel thinks this distinction disguises numerous confusions. But, on the other hand, this “identification” does not mean that he is *concluding* something about the world from some intelligibility or logical requirement, in the manner of Descartes concluding from the fact that I can clearly distinguish mind and body that they must be distinct, that one order establishes something about the other order. This distinction between such orders is what is being denied in Hegel’s *Logic*, even while (and here another massive turn of the difficulty screw) he is not identifying things with thoughts or interpreting thought’s determination of itself as of metaphysical significance because such self-determination is the manifestation of some cosmic entity’s (the Absolute’s) knowledge of itself.⁴⁷

47. This is the point that, I think, Stephen Houlgate (2006) misses when he says that in my attempt in 1989 to “protect” transcendental logic from a confusion with ontology, I am reintroducing “a distinction between being as it is and being as it is *thought*” (140). Or that I distinguish between “all that being could *intelligibly* be” and “all that being could intelligibly *be*” (141). These are precisely the distinctions I want to *deny* in trying to understand EL §24. Or, what I am denying is what I take it *he* is denying: that we know something about how “beings oppose one another” *by* knowing something about conceptually contrastive relations. And if there is no such inference, we have to be able to explain the basis of the “identity” (which I agree Hegel is trying to assert). We don’t get such a claim “for free.” (I criticize Hegel for sometimes giving the impression that there is a “formal-material mode” *inference* [Pippin 1989, 187].) This is far and away the most common conundrum in discussions of Hegel as “metaphysician” or “post-Kantian,” largely because the issue is so difficult to formulate properly. My objection to Houlgate is that he does not much address the enormous complications in the assumptions behind, and the implications of, any such claim as “‘being’ is simply what we are aware of through thought and its categories, and an account of the basic categories of thought has to be an account of *being*” (141). That position, stated that way, is basically Christian Wolff’s, not Hegel’s. For Wolff, logic just *is* ontology. That is, Houlgate’s formulation alone does nothing to distinguish logical (the merely thinkable) from real possibility, a central issue between Kant and Hegel since, as will be discussed below, Hegel cannot avail himself of Kant’s versions of the sensible conditions of the real, the pure subjective forms of intuition. See also Stern 2009, 10–20. (This is not to say that there are not a number of infelicities in the 1989 formulations, many of them rightly seen as such by Houlgate, Stern, and Bowman.)

Further, we should of course be wary of attributing to Hegel psychologism or subjective idealism, but we should not be so wary that we lose touch completely with the fact that *The Science of Logic* is the science of such acts, construed “logically,” that is, with respect to rendering anything properly intelligible, giving its proper sufficient reason to be as it is. There are of course many various sorts of such sufficient reasons, and so the task of the *SL* must be quite ambitiously comprehensive, especially since Hegel will object to any claim of radical incommensurability among such grounds. Hegel is a monist in this sense, a logical monist. There are no incommensurable spheres of rational intelligibility—cognitive, moral, aesthetic—as there are, say, in Kant.⁴⁸ (And even Kant struggled to be able to appeal to the same general logical framework—his “architectonic”—of intelligibility in presenting both the second and third *Critique*.) But the initial, simple point at issue now is that anything’s being at all would be mere indeterminate and indistinguishable being were it not conceptually determinate, articulable—in the simplest sense, an instance of a concept. As in Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*, to be anything is to be a determinate something, and that principle of determination can be considered “for itself.” It is what Hegel calls “the Concept” (what Aristotle called substantial form).⁴⁹ As he says,

the nature, the specific essence, that which is truly permanent and substantial in the manifold and accidentality of appearance and fleeting externalization, is the concept of the thing, the universal which is present in it. (*SL* 21.15)

And this raises Hegel’s main question in the *Logic*: how to account for conceptual content, or as he would put it, conceptual determinacy, given the various modalities of the possibility of object determinacy. The answer to that question will depend on two very difficult elements in Hegel’s project: the claim quoted earlier that the form of the concept is the form of a self, and that, accordingly, the truth is self-consciousness; and the claim that the way to understand this content is to understand these concepts as “self-negating,”

48. “Hegel’s monism is an effort to display as one concrete self-developing system the unity of the subject in all experience.” Mure 1940, 170.

49. I don’t mean that Aristotle meant by substantial form what Hegel meant by the Concept. There are significant differences. I mean only that each term functions in the same way, as the basic principle of intelligibility. Rohs (1982, 4–6) is right to include Hegel within the tradition of “form ontology.” He subscribes to the basic tenets: *forma dat esse rei*; and *ens et unum convertuntur*.

but in a way that promises a positive result. These are also the elements in Hegel's account which will contribute to an explanation of how he thinks an *a priori* determination of objective content is possible, given his disagreement with Kant's supposedly overly "subjective" account.

Metaphysics

But to return to the identity claim, what do we mean by "metaphysics"? We might again take our bearings from Aristotle. What there is must be determinate. At the metaphysical level, anything's "determinations" are just the general predicates without which any specific determination would not be possible, the forms of any such possible specific determination. For Aristotle, the task of metaphysics is not to say of any particular thing what it is, nor does it deduce what beings there are. That is the task of the special sciences. Metaphysics' task is to determine what must be true of anything at all, such that what it is in particular can be determined (or: what is necessarily presupposed in any such specification).⁵⁰ Hegel agrees. That is the conception of metaphysics intended in the quotations just cited. As with Aristotle, this link between the order of thinking (knowing, judging to be the case) and the order of being is not an inference, does not face a gap that must be closed by an inference. Properly understood, the relation is one of identity (a conceptual identity, not an ontological identity).

It especially concerns itself with concepts and distinctions that are as fundamental as the following but that immediately have the air of paradox. How can not-being be? Given the infinite divisibility of a continuum, how is motion possible? What accounts for the identity of an object, or of a person, throughout alterations in time? What kinds of objects are numbers, if they are objects at all? How is consciousness possible in a material being? And so

50. The philosopher understands a special sort of all-inclusive, absolutely all-inclusive, universality, as when Aristotle says: "It is appropriate for him who has the best understanding about each genus to be able to state the firmest principles of that actual subject, and hence, when his subject is being qua being, to state the firmest principles of everything: and this man is the philosopher" (1994a, 1005b812). This is of course only an analogy (being is not a genus), but the "firmest principles of everything" is what Hegel calls the Absolute or, sometimes, as Aristotle does here, simply "philosophy." We should note that Aristotle moves easily, synonymously, from treating being qua being as the subject, to the principles thereof, what Hegel would call its logical moments. These are identical. See Kosman's (1994) formulation of the range (i.e., everything) of what he calls (in a non-Hegelian idiom) the "predicative facts" "whose structure and nature Aristotle endeavors to understand" (195).

forth. The general distinction drawn by McDowell is the most important to keep in mind.

The concepts of propositional attitudes have their proper home in explanations of a special sort: explanations in which things are made intelligible by being revealed to be, or to approximate to being, as they rationally ought to be. This is to be contrasted with a style of explanation in which one makes things intelligible by representing their coming into being as a particular instance of how things generally tend to happen.⁵¹

Being revealed to be a manifestation of some order of reason will require that we understand how there could be such an order of reason and what it consists in. That is the task of the *Science of Logic*. And it remains deeply Aristotelian in spirit. As in

what we seek is the cause, i.e., the form, by reason of which the matter is some definite thing; and this is the substance of the thing. (*Metaphysics* 1041b7–9)

As we have seen, logic has emerged in Kant as something much more than the study of valid forms of inference, but much less than an account of the laws that thinking does or ought to obey, or as categorizing a basic ontological structure. It states the conditions of possible sense, the distinctions and relations without which sense would not be possible. For Hegel this ambition already represents a task of great philosophical substance. It is the way he wants to understand the question of the validity of the categories, their “truth,” as he says, “in and for itself.”⁵² The questions that emerge from Hegel’s “expansion” of Kant’s logic are how we determine what those conditions are and whether they can be rightly confined to what the avoidance of logical contradiction will allow, whether the “emptiness” that Kant ascribes to these forms can be maintained.

This is the beginning of an issue that we will return to several times. Kant seemed to say that because pure concepts can stand in no immediate relation to objects, such that object-content must be supplied “from without,”

51. McDowell 1998, 328.

52. As we shall see, the ways in which we can make sense of the world are the ways in which the world can make sense, full stop. (No need for any “for us.”) See SL 21.28, and Wolff’s (2013) discussion. See also the second addition to EL §24, and SL 21.48.

philosophical or a priori knowledge cannot determine anything about what there is. Pure reason could, though, determine a new modality of possibility, “real possibility” (to be distinguished from mere logical possibility). This determination of what *could* “really” be is not achieved by the understanding alone. It is due to there being an a priori form of representation for all given content, the pure forms of intuition. The Metaphysical Deduction establishes the kind of involvement of the understanding in the availability of any manifold that demonstrates what must be the case for anything to be the object it is, but “only” as an object of experience, an appearance. Since Hegel relies on no such representation of givenness, it might seem, has seemed to many, that he means to assert against Kant that concepts can stand in an immediate relation to objects, thus reinstituting the rationalist claim to have a priori direct knowledge of the real as it is in itself. But this is to saddle Hegel with a host of Kantian assumptions he does not share. The *Logic* is never said to seek a determination of what is “really” real, and, in a way like Kant, it also concerns the determination of the possibility, the real possibility, of anything being what it is. Hegel calls this *Wirklichkeit*, actuality, and distinguishes it often from questions about existence. As noted above with Aristotle, the task is to say of anything not what it is but what it must be such that a determination of what it is could be possible. As we shall see in chapter 7, for Hegel to claim that “Life” is a logical concept is to say not that there could not be a world that did not have living beings in it, but that if there is a world at all, the denial that there is any distinction between mechanically explicable and organically unified beings is self-contradictory. It is a way of arguing against absolute mechanism, and this involves his typical and always extraordinarily ambitious claim: that life must be said to be the “truth” of mechanism. This is not the deduction of the necessity of living beings. It is a determination of Hegel’s version of the really possible: actuality.

So what Hegel means by saying that logic *is* metaphysics, or that being in and for itself *is* the concept, can be put this way.⁵³ Once we understand

53. There are any number of ways to put this, one of which follows Moore (2012) in his characterization of metaphysics: we cannot be said to be making sense of our making sense of things, unless we actually are making sense of things; otherwise we would be making sense of how we fail to make sense, a possible project but one that is parasitic on the former. I note again Pinkard (1988), although I think the notion of the “explanation of possibility” in Hegel is more capacious than he acknowledges. See also Bole 1974 and Brinkman 2011. An account of the categorical determination of possible content is for Hegel a determination not of “thought-content” but of “actuality.” This bears on the general/transcendental logic relation discussed in this chapter. So if a Hegelian categorical analysis can show that the concept of freedom necessary to establish respon-

the role of, say, essence and appearance as necessary for judging objectively, we have *thereby made sense* of essences and appearances, and therewith, the world in which they are indispensable. (We have made sense not of some species-specific feature of human sense-makers, but of the sense the world could make.)⁵⁴ The basic unit of sense-making, in Aristotle, in Kant, and in a revised way in Hegel, is the predicative act. In making sense of *this* way of sense-making, its presuppositions and implications, we *are* making sense of what there is, the only sense anything could make. (A phrase of Aryeh Kosman's in discussing Aristotle is relevant here: "predication is nothing but the logical or discursive face of being.")⁵⁵ What there is must be determinate, and its "determinations" are just its predicates, the content of which depends on their roles in possible judgments. (We will discuss in a moment Kant's great anxiety about this way of proceeding.)

Now, this level of abstraction can obscure a number of important differences. One sense of the "forms of thought" could involve only the notion of logic as contentless in Kant's sense, perhaps tautologous in the early Wittgensteinian sense, the mere constitutive forms of *any* possible sense or intelligibility, the negation of which is not in any carefully considered sense *at all* conceivable.⁵⁶ (Or perhaps one might want to say that the very constituents of any possible sense cannot thereby themselves make sense; they delimit possible sense without themselves being sensible.) When Kant called logic "the science of the rules of understanding in general" (*CPR* A52/B76), he meant to set out what constitutes *possible thought as such*, not what we, as

sibility is compatible with a concept of determinism consistent with modern natural science, this establishes not just that the two concepts need not be incompatible but that they *are* compatible, that "things are such" that the true assertion of both is unavoidable. The precise statement of the modality issue is a topic in itself, however.

54. This is obviously all a variation of the principle of sufficient reason, as Hegel was well aware. Cf.

Anything which is, is to be considered to exist not as an immediate, but as a posited; there is no stopping at immediate existence but a return must rather be made from it back into its ground. (*SL* 11.293)

55. Kosman 2013, 127. Cf. deVries 1993, using an analogy with a logical language: "The ideal language must be its own meta-language. It must contain its own truth content and be capable of expressing its own relation to the world (and itself) truthfully" (234).

There is a lucid statement of the implications of this sort of approach to "the Absolute" in Hegel by Redding (2007): "Rather the absolute is to be thought of as something the structure of which is expressed or shown in the logic of our self-correcting attempts to talk about the world" (232).

56. In the senses (in Kant, Frege, and Wittgenstein) traced by Conant 1991.

human beings, could make sense of, or the rules we ought to be following, but just what *could be* sense.⁵⁷ But what interests Hegel about any such delimitation is what interests Kant too; it is the general idea of the suitability of such absolutely universal forms of sense, no matter our actual theory of formal logic, for a consideration of any possible thought of objects—in Kant the relation between general and transcendental logic. This involves the *immediate bearing* of such logical form on the question of possible thought of objects: the bearing, say, of the subject-predicate form on the thought of substances and properties; the bearing of antecedent-consequence relations for the thought of necessary connections among events. This notion of such an immediate bearing is proposed by Kant independent of any transcendental deduction, and one can understand a great deal of Hegel as emanating from a claim about Kant's so-called Metaphysical Deduction—to wit, that there is a lot of philosophy already involved in such a “deduction” and that it is an achievement. This means that for Hegel, the direct bearing of a general logic on any possible transcendental logic is actually another way of stating the identity claim in §24 of the EL, and is not a mere restating or reorganizing of logical facts of the matter. (In Kantian language, the claim of EL §24 would be that functions of judgment *are* categories.)⁵⁸ It involves the intimation on Kant's part of the speculative “identity” Hegel had announced, quoted earlier, and so it is of much greater importance than Kant admitted for understanding the proper philosophical specification of these forms of thought, especially in their interrelation to each other. (The actual Kantian statement of this “identity” is the highest principle of synthetic judgments, and it invokes the same thought: that the conditions for the possibility of experience are at the same time the conditions for the possibility of objects of experience. Or it can be so read when we realize that the “subjectivity” referred to in the “conditions for the possibility of experience” clause refers to what Hegel would call an “absolute” subjectivity, one that refers to an unlimited or unbounded notion of subjectivity, not Kant's official “finite” subjectivity, defined by the role of the pure forms of intuition.)

So it is of some significance in Kant that the forms of possible thought already determine, already in some sense are, the only possible forms of the thought of things, that the logical constitution of possible sense is the

57. This is a bit more complicated because Kant does sometimes talk as if discursivity is some sort of species characteristic, especially when he is contrasting it with God's intuitive intellect. But that need not detain us here.

58. Cf. the discussion in Wolff (2013, 72–73), to which I am indebted.

form of the only possible sense that can be made of things; or it is of some direct significance that the subject-predicate form should have anything to do with substances and properties in the world. It is, let us say, the intimacy or even inseparability between general and transcendental logic that interests Hegel. (Ultimately Hegel will want to claim that it is not the case that general logic as Kant understands it should be seen as something like a basic form to which content is “added.” Rather the basic form of possible thought, rendering intelligible, is content-directed, and any general logic is an *abstraction* from such modes of thinking. We will need to see more in the following chapter about the apperceptive character of thinking, even in general logic, before that point can be made clearer.)

Stated in Kant’s terms, the Metaphysical Deduction can be established before we supposedly learn, as a result of the Deduction, that given our sensible forms of intuition, all that being a substance bearing properties could be “for us” is the permanent in time undergoing temporal alterations, or all that necessary connection between events could amount to “for us” is necessary succession according to a rule. And Hegel will give us other reasons for thinking that the relation between the general and the transcendental logic is more intimate than had been realized. Stated another way, for Hegel, thought’s reflective determination of its own possibility (an “access” to itself confirmed by simply thinking, since any thinking is also at the same time consciousness of thinking) has immediate consequences for the objects of thought. The idea of an object conceived as not an object of thought, as unthinkable, is an idle, self-canceling thought.

So, as Adrian Moore in his recent book on the history of metaphysics points out in his account of Frege, if one attributes to Frege the task of making sense of mathematical *sense*, how different can that be from attributing to him the task of making sense of mathematics?⁵⁹ And here is a formulation in Moore worthy of Hegel:

To make sense of things at the highest level of generality . . . is to make sense of things in terms of *what it is to make sense of things*; it is to be guided by the sheer nature of the enterprise. To attempt to do that is necessarily to reflect on one’s own activity, and to try to make sense, in particular, of the sense that one makes of things.⁶⁰

59. Moore 2012, 216.

60. Moore 2012, 7.

Just so; perfect Hegelese. We can also state the point in Brandomese. There is a kind of sense dependence between metaphysically conceived “things” and ways of making sense, but not a reference dependence. So the claim that “logic” is “metaphysics” would not mean that finite particulars depend for their *existence* on the referring expressions that pick them out, or that they exist only when being thought, or that “really” there are no spatio-temporal finite particulars in the normal sense but just artifacts, perhaps mental or ideal artifacts, of our ways of sorting things out. Rather, as Robert Brandom puts it,

the concepts of singular term and object are reciprocally sense-dependent. One cannot understand either without at least implicitly understanding the other and the basic relations between them.⁶¹

He makes the same sort of sense dependence case for “a fact” and “what is assertable in a proposition”; likewise between “law and necessity” on the one hand, and “counterfactually robust inference” on the other. And he generally tries to establish this kind of dependence between modally robust material exclusions in reality and subjective processes for identifying such exclusions and trying to avoid incompatible commitments.

Brandom’s own formulations about the question of the status of the “logical” concepts interrogated by Hegel in the *SL* sound very close to the line pursued here, but with a couple of critical differences, and it would be useful to stress those similarities and differences.

On the “similarity” side, consider:

I take it that Hegel’s distinctively philosophical, logical, or speculative (a translation common in English versions of Hegel for his “*begreifende*”) concepts—including the “form determinations of the Concept” with which the *Science of Logic* is principally concerned—have a characteristic expressive role that is quite different from that of ordinary, nonphilosophical concepts. Their job is not to make explicit how the world is (to subserve a function of consciousness) but rather to make explicit the process of making explicit how the world is (to enable and embody a kind of self-consciousness).⁶²

61. Brandom 2002, 196–97.

62. Brandom 2005, 155. This of course echoes the characterization we have attributed to Aristotle, as well as the quotation from Moore cited earlier.

Here too we would have to say that this sort of conception of the logical task cannot be understood as of no relevance to what could be an object of empirical inquiry. In Brandom's terms, if the process of discrimination and explanation at the empirical level requires, must assume, strong modal realism, alethic material relations of impossibility, exclusion, preclusion, and material inference, then the logical level cannot be conceived formally. These are metaphysical and unrevisable conditions.

But Brandom does not want to accept such a characterization, and so there are two important differences between his account and the one defended here. In the first place, Brandom's account of "making explicit the process of making explicit" is fundamentally retrospective in a strong sense. That is, any "progressive" empirical inquiry (which, for Brandom, as for Hegel, involves meaning change, often radical, not just information accumulation), in our interactions with the world, experience of recalcitrant observations, anomalies, discoveries, and so forth, *is the basic process* that then calls for a retrospective and analytic reconstruction, making explicit, of the process of empirical making explicit itself. It is the latter, empirical inquiry that is the source of the contentful internal negation in the process that is then thematized at the logical level.

We have seen enough of Hegel's formulations to know that a philosophical logic has a much more ambitious program: not just recounting the assumptions emerging in the empirical process of concept revision, but accounting for presuppositions of such a process without which any empirical making explicit and revision would not be possible. There is a self-transforming logic inherent in that logical level itself, and it makes a claim of necessity. *The Science of Logic* makes explicit that without which an empirical making explicit would not be possible, not what turns out to be assumed in its empirical self-transformation, where that empirical self-transformation is the "engine" on which a *Science of Logic* rides. This involves metaphysical commitments in the sense we have been exploring here. So this formulation by Brandom is too weak to capture what Hegel is after.

On this view, determinateness—like truth and knowledge of how things objectively are—is a concept with real and important application; the kind of normative assessment it codifies is not dissolved in a corrosive anything-goes skeptical soup. (Hegel's image is "the night in which all cows are black.") *But it has become a diachronic, functional concept, applicable only in virtue of the role a concept plays in an expressively progressive tradition: the way*

it develops, in concert with its fellows, through experience. This is a temporal, or better, historical semantic functionalism (and therefore, a kind of holism), in addition to the inferential semantic functionalism (and therefore holism), we have already considered. (My emphasis)⁶³

(Actually Brandom's position is closer to Hegel's than this passage indicates because the passage elides two different things. There is the work we have cut out for us in a historical semantic functionalism; and there is the case we have to make that this is the work cut out for us about semantic change. The latter is not an episode in the former. Brandom's *Making It Explicit* is not such an episode but a making explicit of what it is to attend to such episodes. Said another way, it is absolute knowledge.)

Second, in a sign of how far we have moved from Hegel in this account, Brandom wants to reject what he sees as Hegel's too ambitious goal for a science of logic, the task Hegel assigns to reason, not to the understanding.

Specifically, I think that Hegel thinks that logical concepts are different from ground-level concepts in one important respect, and like them in another. They are unlike determinate empirical concepts in that Hegel thinks that there can, indeed must be a final, fully expressively adequate set of logical concepts, whose application in practice will never oblige their users to revise or relinquish them. He is a strong semantic optimist about logical concepts. Indeed, he thinks that in his *Logic*, he has presented such a system of logical concepts.⁶⁴

This is what Brandom wants to reject in favor of something more moderate, given that empirical inquiry is not exhaustible on his account, and so the task of this retrospective exfoliation of "the process" is also never at an end. But however difficult it is to understand, Hegel clearly thinks that *there is* an autonomous philosophical task in "making explicit the process of making explicit," to invoke Brandom's own book, as noted above. The direction of dependence goes the other way, not the empiricist way suggested by Brandom when he says such things as,

For Hegel clearly takes it that the only way it is possible, in principle, to understand, specify, or convey logical or philosophical concepts is by ratio-

63. Brandom 2005, 153.

64. Brandom 2005, 156.

nal reconstruction of an expressively progressive tradition of which *they are the product*.⁶⁵ (My emphasis)

Moreover, the account given so far is incomplete. As stated, Brandom's most useful notion, "sense dependence," can look like some version of verificationism, or a dogmatic claim in a theory of meaning, or it is a kind of pragmatic dismissal of any such critical questions about the authority with which we claim such dependence. As I will discuss later, Hegel's dissatisfaction with Kant and with his transcendental deduction does not mean that he dismisses all of Kant's critical questions about such sense dependence. One can gain some sense of Hegel's response to that question by entertaining the possibility of denying any such putative dependence—say, denying that a condition of the determinacy of any particular is our being able to distinguish essence and appearance—and seeing what happens. In effect, that is the "argument" of the logic of essence, and its failure, a kind of *reductio*, is what *establishes* this dependence.

Logic

But having looked at the "identity" claim and the understanding of "metaphysics," we need also to understand at least a bit more of how Hegel understands the "logic" side of that claim in §24 of the EL that with him "now" logic *is* metaphysics. The question is what Hegel counts as the domain of what Frege called "the logical" (*das Logische*).⁶⁶ As is obvious, Hegel's *Logic* looks nothing like what we would recognize as a modern or symbolic or mathematical logic, and even nothing like a *Begriffsschrift* oriented from the

65. Brandom 2005, 157. There are other formulations in this article that suggest a different story. For example,

What his logical concepts are adequate for is just making explicit the process by which determinate content is conferred on or incorporated in the ground-level empirical and practical concepts that articulate our consciousness of how things are: the process of determining conceptual content through experience. Being able to deploy those logical, so metaconceptual, expressive resources Hegel has developed out of the raw materials he inherited from the philosophical tradition is achieving a certain kind of semantic self-consciousness. (156)

But "developed out of the raw materials he inherited from the philosophical tradition" leaves too much in "develop" unclarified and treats this inheritance of raw materials "as a kind of unsystematic fact of the matter."

66. As in Frege (1980, 90), when he poses his famous three principles and insists first of all on separating "the psychological" from "the logical."

internal requirements of such a *Schrift*.⁶⁷ It involves no logical calculus, does not provide formation rules that stipulate a well-formed formula or inferences rules (rules for truth-preserving moves in a logical calculus), and is not even a reflection on the ontological (concepts, objects, relations) and even existential commitments (numbers) of logic understood this way (as in Frege, for example).⁶⁸ There is the general similarity that both logic and metaphysics attempt to render transparent (“make explicit,” again in Brandomese) the basic structure of any “rendering intelligible,” but the *SL* doesn’t go much beyond that similarity in the notion of a logic. For whatever the connections are in the *SL*, they are clearly not truth-functional or deductive. As suggested, they have something to do with the demonstration of dependence relations necessary for successful conceptual determinacy.⁶⁹ That is not an altogether clear project, but it has nothing to do with logical calculability, something ideally wholly algorithmic in the sense descended from Alonzo Church. To put the same point about calculability in a broader way, Hegel’s logic is not and cannot be reconstructed as symbolic (indifferent to content).⁷⁰

This is all not because Hegel is wedded to the absoluteness of the standard term logic, at least not as it is usually understood. That is, his basic conception of logic is a term logic, but he has a different understanding of its elements than is traditional (as in the following sentence), and he thinks we have to work especially hard to understand how it might be used to assert the “speculative proposition.” The basic unit of rendering intelligible is *predicative*, but that does not mean that Hegel thinks of concepts as atomic, self-

67. Kant divides “logic” into “particular” logics (*besondere*) that consider only the proof-theories of special disciplines. So there can be logics of mathematics, judicial or medical logics, and so forth. As Wolff (2013) points out, since Frege’s *Begriffsschrift* expresses the logic of mathematical induction, it (and for other reasons, Aristotle’s *Posterior Analytics*) cannot be considered a universal (*allgemeine*) logic. It is also why it is wrong to claim that Kant’s conception of logic cannot accommodate modern mathematical logic, as Wolff (2009, 151–63) has shown.

68. If, like Dummett (1973, 432, correcting Frege) or Hacking (1979), we take the *definiens* of logic to be rules of derivation, and not the characteristics of sentences (truth), there is some plausible similarity with Hegel’s enterprise. But derivation in Hegel is not deduction and not formalizable.

69. And the nature of that dependence is different, in each “logic.” See EL §161, where he marks these distinctions and makes clear the level of interpretive difficulty one faces when he notes that in the logic of the Concept, we are finally dealing with the “free being of the whole concept.”

70. A much fuller account of the resistance of Hegel’s logic and its forms of inference to symbolization (something of a fad in the 1960s) can be found in Lachterman 1987.

sufficient units of intelligibility, copulated “externally” in standard assertoric judgments.⁷¹ The very existence of the SL’s development manifests clearly that Hegel does not think concepts can be independent units of meaning. Hegel is thus (in his own quite distinctive way) as committed to the “context principle” as Frege, and it is part of the point of the whole enterprise, as the presence of reflective movement manifests, to demonstrate that concepts can be determinately specified only by their role in judgments, the determinacy of which depends on their roles as premises and conclusions in syllogisms, which themselves are related systematically.⁷² And he never tires of noting that the standard subject-predicate logical form is finally inadequate for the expression of “speculative truth.” We are not in a position to know yet what he does mean, positively, but he is not (or at the very least, does not regard himself as) trapped by standard scholastic assumptions unique to a term or judgmental logic.⁷³

For another thing, for someone like Frege, logic is about possible truth-bearers, what he calls *Gedanke*, thoughts (the sentential *Sinn* or meaning of, paradigmatically, assertoric sentences, to be distinguished for him from judgments or beliefs, actually *taking* the thought to be true). As already indicated, Hegel (following Kant) is trying to account for *any* possible rendering intelligible, something that forces attention much more on the activity of “making sense” than on the internal constituents of a proposition, understood somewhat spatially.⁷⁴ As noted before, Hegel certainly is a partisan of the traditional logic. The basic possibility of sense depends on an act, an act of

71. This is an issue to which we shall be returning frequently. See EL §§40, 225, 231, 237, for indications of Hegel’s position, and the discussion in Hanna (1986). The standard view (often mistakenly attributed to Hegel by taking the logic of being as typical rather than provisional), that this is the way Hegel thinks of logic (as a term or concept logic), is clear in Tugendhat (1970, 152). See Theunissen (1980, 66), whose critique of Tugendhat I agree with.

72. The commentator who has done more to emphasize and explain this is Brandom (inter alia, 1994, 92; 2000a, 159–60), about which much more later. See especially the clear account in Redding (2007, 57, 86, 104) and Tiles (2004). By contrast, according to Hegel, the way concepts are understood by the understanding is as graspable independently, and so as “abstract” universals; their content is “abstracted” from the inferential processuality necessary for the determinacy of the content. See Bowman (2013, 35) and his objections to elements of Brandom’s approach (102–33).

73. When we return to this issue of the difference between speculative and standard judgments, we can see what is wrong with Russell’s imputation to Hegel of Bradley’s thesis—that in all judgment we are ascribing a predicate to “Reality as a whole”—and with Russell’s claim that Hegel everywhere “uncritically” assumes the traditional subject-predicate form. Russell 1914, 48.

74. For a defense of this formulation and more on what it entails, see Tolley 2011.

rendering intelligible or judging. This is why he says that the true beginning of the *Logic* is the “resolve” to think anything at all, to do something, even if not at all in the sense of an action. This immediately raises the question of how a Hegelian ought to respond to what is widely known as “Frege’s point,” or the Frege-Geach point, that a proposition, the unit of intelligibility, may appear as asserted or not asserted and be recognizably the same proposition, and so that the question of assertoric force should be strictly separated from the intelligibility of the truth-bearers, but that question would take us far afield here.⁷⁵

Kant, by contrast, divided all logic into what he called a “universal elementary logic” (*allgemeine Elementarlogik*) and a “specific use of the understanding” (*besondere Verstandesgebrauch*); what he called general or formal logic is a division of the former, and what he called transcendental logic, a “pure” or nonempirical subdivision of the latter.⁷⁶ General logic is his version of the forms of valid inference: ultimately categorical, hypothetical, and disjunctive syllogisms, and the judgment forms and conceptual components that comprise the basic elements of such forms. General logic is supposed to be strictly universal. There is *no* possible form of intelligible thought not of a judgmental form composed of such conceptual elements, capable of playing the role of premises or conclusions in such syllogisms. For Kant, this is because, in an innovation in his treatment already mentioned, general logic is said to *have no content*. That notion now requires some more discussion.

It doesn’t of course mean that the notions in a general logic are or could be treated as mere uninterpreted symbols. Kant’s logical pure concepts of the

75. Besides such things as his worries about psychologism and besides the general “Frege (or Frege-Geach) point,” Frege was also of course quite critical of the confusions, as he saw them, in traditional logic between concept and object, or the inability of the tradition to appreciate the difference between class membership (an individual falling under a concept) and class inclusion (one concept falling under another). This would usually require some notion of a unit class or individual concept that Frege would have none of. But neither Kant nor Hegel was guilty of this. And Kant was explicitly critical of the understanding of judgment as a relation between concepts. It was better understood as the claim that the objects that fall under the subject concept fall under the predicate concept (thus distinguishing class membership from class inclusion). For Kant, see Manley Thompson (1972, 334), and Longuenesse (2007, 86). Hegel is clearer than Kant that insofar as intuitions play any role in judgment, they do so as unique sorts of conceptual representations, not an infima species, not individual concepts, but as *this-suches* (both *this* and *such*).

76. Kant (*CPR*) does not explicitly say that transcendental logic is a *besondere Logik*, but Wolff (1984, 190) shows that is what he must mean. (See also Wolff 1995, 23, where he calls transcendental logic “die Fachlogik der Metaphysik.”) Kant also calls it a *Wissenschaft*, the science of the rules of the understanding, at B76.

understanding are clearly determinate kinds of discrimination and affirmation (How much? Of what sort? Is so or is not so? Either so or not so? If such and such, then this or that).⁷⁷ But their domain is completely unrestricted, not tied to any sort or range of objects. But this already complicates that relation between general logic and “the forms of thought considered with respect to any possible experiential object,” or transcendental logic, because it is part of Kant’s epistemology, not a theorem in his logic, that content can be provided only receptively, for finite knowers, and for us that means sensibly.⁷⁸ Although he is relying on Aristotelian logic, this is not a distinction that would have occurred to Aristotle. *The basic kinds of being there* just show up in sortal predications, in the way “Socrates is a man,” “that is a stone,” sort *substances*, and “is white” and “is musical” designate *quality*, the qualitative *modes of being*. This may have been what Hegel meant by saying that the old metaphysics simply assumed that thoughts were the “essentialities” of things, as if these essentialities were themselves things or substantial entities.⁷⁹

In the traditional reading of Kant,⁸⁰ it would appear that Kant wants to

77. See the discussion in Wolff 1995. Another way of putting what Kant is doing: he takes the logical constants essential for evaluating success of any inference—all, one, some, is, is not, is-non, if-then, either/or, the so-called syncategorematic expressions—and understands them as *terms* (categorematic, or as having internal significance), or “pure concepts of the understanding.” This sets him up for a “move” Hegel thinks is already just thereby made: how to get from the table of logical functions of the understanding to the table of categories, concepts of possible objects.

78. This is stressed by McFarlane 2001. The innovation in question—that for Kant, general logic was “empty of content”—is not straightforward, however, as I discuss in a moment, and the claim that for “pre-Kantian” logicians logic simply coincided with ontology (rather than being about a special object—thinking) is controversial (with regard to the Port Royal logicians anyway). McFarlane’s basic claim is valuable in this context, that since logic is *a priori* and general, it has to be formal in *this* sense (empty of all content), because Kant has an independent theory of possible content: only through pure or sensuous intuition. The theory of formality is not an essential part of the theory of logic but a substantive philosophical claim. Put another way, Kant’s conception of general logic cannot be exactly what he says it is, because his account of such a logic includes a substantive philosophical claim: the *Critique’s* doctrine of substantive content.

79. Cf. the discussion of Aristotle as the founder of the science of logic in the addition to EL §20.

80. By a traditional reading of Kant, I mean the impositionist reading sketched below. The key here for Hegel turns on the question of subjectivity and its relation to psychology. At the heart of the issue is how to interpret what many have taken to be the core argument in the book, stretching from the Aesthetic through to the Second Analogy. The plausibly assumed Kantian claim is that without the possibility of making a distinction between a subjective succession of representations and a representation of objective succession (something possible only if the category of causality is objectively valid), there could not be a “unity of apperception,” a single subject across a temporal succession of experience. This all sounds like a relativization of the argument to what a finite subject requires. Hegel, we shall see, will interpret the unity of apperception as “the

introduce a step here, as if skeptical about why “our” ways of sorting things should have anything to do with “sortal realism” in the world. But this way of looking at Kant’s treatment of the relation between general and transcendental logic—which we are exploring as a possible perspective on that §24 identification—is implicated in a much broader set of interpretive claims that themselves raise problems of book-length dimensions.

The issue will be familiar to anyone familiar with a textbook Kant; call it the two-step picture. In this picture, there must “first” be sensible receptivity (according to “our” distinct, nonconceptual pure forms of intuition), and “then” there is conceptual articulation/synthesis, which is possible because of the imposition of categorical form. To some extent this requirement is a consequence of Kant’s view of judgment—that some component of the judgment must be a way of referring to objects—and another way of saying something about the object. But since, for Kant as well as for Frege, interpreted concepts determine extensions, this picture of separability and independent contributions to knowledge looks problematic. That is, if this idea of some possible independent contribution from sensibility is dubious, either as a reading of Kant or in itself (if the two sources of knowledge are notionally distinct, but inseparable in any concrete experience), then the general/transcendental logic distinction, which depends on this understanding of “contentless” versus “having content” or “being provided with content exogenously,” would have to be rethought as well.⁸¹

The denial of such a two-step picture, or the assertion of this inseparability, introduces a number of different issues. For one thing, Hegel’s claim about inseparability is not a prelude to any denial of the distinguishability of concept and intuition, and so to an argument for the wholly conceptual nature even of particulars or representations of particulars.⁸² For another,

Concept” and will take its scope as a condition to be “absolute.” This means that the Concept and its myriad necessary moments (the *SL* itself) are necessary both for the discriminability of any distinct object as what it is, and for the determinate unity necessary for the object *to be* determinately what it is.

81. Fichte’s word for the implications of this “distinguishable but not separable” doctrine is “*Teilbarkeit*,” as if the notions represent moments on a continuum. For a fuller account of the inseparability claim, see Pippin 1989 and 2005. We should also heed here the warning of Michael Wolff (2013). He notes that just as we should not overinterpret Kant’s claim that general logic has *no* content, we should be careful about Hegel’s positive claims about logical content. The *Science of Logic* is not, does not have the content of, the Philosophy of Nature or the Philosophy of Spirit. Another reason not to think of it as substantive, “furniture of the universe” metaphysics.

82. What we have to understand is Hegel’s denial that synthesis, as the source of unity, should be understood as “external reflection.” Rather, there is such a thing as an “immanent synthesis” (21.83), and therewith “immanent form” (12.144).

Hegel fully realizes the extreme difficulties in stating properly the dual claims of distinguishability and inseparability. In fact one could easily interpret all of Hegel after *Glauben und Wissen*, the early Jena work in which he first realized clearly what he called there the “organic” unity of concept and intuition, as various ways of addressing those difficulties. We can make analogies. We can say that pitch and timbre in a musical passage cannot be separated, as if one could be added to the other, even though they are different from one another. But these only go so far, and Hegel clearly wants a way of understanding the mutual dependence of each on the other that involves an “identity” even “within difference.” In other words, he came to see that the concept-intuition relation was at its heart a *logical or conceptual problem*, what he would variously call the problem of (how there could be such a thing as) “mediated immediacy,” or the inescapably reciprocal and correlated functions of identifying and differentiating.⁸³ For another, in any apperceptive determination of content, any act of thinking, a relation to content has to be understood as a modality of a self-relation. (More on this in the next chapter.) The knower is related to itself in knowing an object or the relation to that object is not cognitive. But it also means that the sensible content, to focus on that example, is also to be understood in its determinacy as a modality of the self-relation. This gets quite complicated because such an apperceptive awareness in the case of perceptual experience itself and the distinct mode in which concepts are involved in the mere uptake of sensible content must be distinguished from apperceptive judging, in which a claim is made on the basis of perceptual experience. Neither Kant nor Hegel believes that experience itself consists in judgments.⁸⁴

The qualification that this example of these logical relations is about features “in experience” is important. Hegel’s *Logic* obviously assumes that something like the basic logical grammar of thought as such (any thought of objects, any mode of rendering intelligible) is reflectively available as such. Since true judgments are also obviously intelligible, the form of any true judgment must embody the forms of intelligibility as such. The only temptation to think otherwise stems from imagining that these must be just the forms of our representings. And what about the representeds? And as we saw above in discussing McDowell, the *Phenomenology of Spirit* is supposed

83. See Rohs (1982, 53) on the *untrennbar* but still *unterschieden* relation of identity and difference as determinations of reflection.

84. In so far as I understand the passage, I think this is similar to Bowman’s (2013, 38) gloss on self-relationality as the basic structure of the Concept. (This is also his gloss on Horstmann’s 1984 discussion.)

to have released us from the grip of such a supposed problem, revealed its presuppositions and therapeutically undermined them. This is why Hegel will say frequently, in explaining his differences with Kant, that the proper question is not whether certain predicates (categories) apply to objects, but whether the predicates are “something true in and of themselves” (EL §28R).

By the need to rethink the general/transcendental logic distinction, I mean the following. None of what we have seen about general logic amounts to a theory of what would be recognized today as a theory of logical truth or falsity. It is, in the sense already sketched for Hegel, a logic of general intelligibility. (Imperatives and aesthetic judgments must also conform to such forms.) Failing to observe the “norms of thinking” is not mistakenly thinking, making an error in thinking; it is not thinking at all, not making any sense. The prospect of objects “outside” something like the limits of the thinkable is a nonthought, a *sinnlose Gedanke*.⁸⁵ But just because it is unthinkable, the strict distinction between a prior, content-free general logic and an a priori transcendental logic, the forms of possible thoughts about objects, can hardly be as hard and fast as Kant wants to make it out to be. Or, put another way, it is an artificial distinction; thought through carefully, according to Hegel, general logic must already *be* transcendental logic, at least *in nuce*. For one thing, as just noted, the distinction depends on a quite contestable strict separation between the spontaneity of thought (as providing formal unity) and the deliverances of sensibility in experience (as the sole “provider of content”).⁸⁶ If that is not sustainable, and there is reason to think even Kant did not hold it to be a matter of strict separability, then the distinction between forms of thought and forms of the thought of objects cannot also be a matter of strict separability.⁸⁷ To consider beings in their intelligibility (what Hegel called “the science of things in thought”) is not to consider them in terms of some species-specific subjective capacity, any more than considering truth-functional relations between sentences in a logic is a consideration of how we happen to go on with sentences.

85. I am convinced here by Tolley (2006). For more on the same point, see Wolff (1984, 186). And on the mere “Schein” of sense, see Conant (1991).

86. I hasten to note that the denial of strict separability is not a denial of distinguishability, as if Hegel thought *there was no sensible receptivity*, no intuitions, there were infima species or “concepts” of individuals. See Pippin 2005.

87. Wolff (1984, 196) suggests that we think, with Hegel, of the relation between formal or general logic and transcendental logic not as *vorgeordnete* but as *beigeordnete*, and that seems wise. He also suggests that the general-logical formulation of “the law of noncontradiction” means it can have not unconditional but only conditional validity.

To be *is* to be intelligible: the founding principle of Greek metaphysics and philosophy itself. (Entertaining the idea of an unintelligible being is not thinking of something strange and limiting; it is not thinking at all.) As with Aristotle, the guiding question is not what is it to be this or what is it to be that, but what is it to be something at all—what is “being something,” and so, what must knowing be, such that being can be known?⁸⁸ Since to be intelligible means to be intelligibly knowable, the formula “to be is to be intelligible” is not, as it might sound, some sort of manifesto, as if willfully “banning” the unknowable from “the real.” It is rather to say that if there is *knowledge* at all, then knowledge is not such as to accept “restrictions.” Such a restricting would have to appeal to something like “our limited capacities,” and that relativization would infect *all knowing*.⁸⁹ All knowing would be restricted to our finite capacities, and that is as much as saying that knowing would not be knowing. “What there is is what is knowable” is an implication of what knowing—all and any knowing—is if it is to be knowing. It is not a first-order claim about all being, as if it could prompt the question: How do we know that all of being is knowable? That is not a coherent question. There may be things we will never know, but that is not to say they are in principle unknowable. So those “two aspect” interpretations of Kant’s idealism and his doctrine of the unknowability of things in themselves, those claiming that knowing “for us” is restricted to “our epistemic conditions,” leaving it open for us to speculate about what might be knowable but transcends our powers of knowing, *cannot* be right. The position is internally incoherent. There is no “our” that can be put in front of “epistemic conditions.” They would not then be *epistemic* conditions; the account would not be philosophical but psychological. This is still true if we introduce so-called pure “subjective” forms of intuition, space and time. Either they are also epistemic conditions or they are not. If they are restrictions, then nothing in the transcendental analytic that depends on them (that is, everything) can be an

88. See Kosman (2013, 152) and Koch (2014) on “logical space.”

89. To be clear about the Kantians, they would no doubt agree: to be is to be intelligible. This is analytic. So the conditions of intelligibility for *everything-that-could-be-intelligible-to-us* are the conditions of determinate being (the unity of a manifold). But that qualification (“to us”) has real bite, because it is elliptically referring to the forms of intuition and so “our” limitation to the deliverances of sensibility. To be (*phenomenal*) is to be intelligible. Hegel thinks this is equivalent to saying that for all that we can render intelligible about an object or event, there is much or something in that object or event we can’t render intelligible, even though it is in principle intelligible. And this is what sounds to him like, we know, but not *really*. And there is no such thing as “sort of knowing.”

epistemic condition.⁹⁰ Understood properly, such a claim about noumenal ignorance could only mean: we can know only what is available, made manifest, to know. To say we do not know things in themselves is to say we cannot know what we cannot know — either a harmless truism or incoherent. (There is nothing that could be known that is in principle unknowable, the first law of philosophical atheism; that is the first law of philosophy.)⁹¹

In just this sense, if we pose a challenge to this principle from the standpoint of the *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, and ask how we can know a priori about nature's suitability for our cognitive ends, and so its purposiveness, we have again imported a kind of neo-Kantian version of Kant and assumed that our forms of cognition are only or merely ours, and so restricted our results to something like "insofar as we could render this intelligible," which is as good as saying we do not know what we are talking about.

Yet more care must be exercised here, lest readers get the wrong idea. To say that the forms of "thought" are, must be, the form of objects of thought does not mean that *any* form of "mere thinking" delineates some ontological realm — as if the forms of the thought of astrological influence are the forms of such influence in the world. We mean first to refer to the forms without which thinking would not be thinking at all, or general logic. In philosophical terms, we have been talking of forms of judgment, possible *knowledge* of objects. It would never occur to us, I assume, to entertain the thought that the form of some piece of empirical knowledge is not the form of the object of knowledge. That would be like entertaining the thought that the form of knowledge is not a form of knowledge. The philosophical topic for Kant is the *form of possible knowledge*. For Hegel, Kant's "clue" about this is a truism; the logical functions of the understanding *in judgment* cannot but be the pure

90. Of course, I realize that Kant's notion of restriction involves a theology, that is, a contrast between our knowing and "God's," or a being with intellectual intuition. It is right to say that Hegel denies this distinction, but that can be confusing. What he is really trying to do is identify them, to claim that knowledge as such is everywhere, as knowledge, divine. This means he reinterprets intellectual intuition so that there is no such contrast. Thought's giving itself its own actuality is the phrase summing up this denial, but that is a longer story. See Pippin (1989, chap. 4) for part of the story about how this goes.

91. See Pippin (1986), my review of the first edition of Henry Allison's *Kant's Transcendental Idealism*. The point is the same as is made by Aristotle in book 4, chapter 3 of *De Anima*, when he says that the mind must not be some nature or it could not become all things, and that mind is nothing, "has no actual existence until it thinks." (There are no limited "epistemic conditions" that are due to the nature of the mind. The mind has no nature in that sense.) Hegel himself makes the point that we must not understand the apperceptive I as some sort of thing, a mind or a soul, at 12.19.

concepts of the understanding, the forms of possible *knowledge* (and thereby the forms of the objects of knowledge). Kant believed that since this left open the possibility that there might be objects given to thought that might not conform to the pure concepts, a deduction was needed, and for that, a use of the pure forms of intuition was necessary. Hegel's account trades instead on a demonstration of the necessity that a putative form is actually a form of possible knowledge. If it can be shown that some putative form is, necessarily, a form of any case of knowledge, the possibility Kant worried about is already foreclosed. Entertaining that possibility is like entertaining the possibility that empirical knowledge is not knowledge, that the form of such knowledge is not the form of objects of knowledge.

Now, this raises an obvious, huge problem. It all places enormous pressure on what amounts to a kind of operator in Hegel's *Logic* on which all the crucial transitions depend, something like: "would not be fully intelligible, would not be coherently thinkable without . . ." What follows the "without" is some more comprehensive concept, a different distinction, and so forth. Excluding logical contradictions would be one obvious instantiation of the operator. But—and the whole possibility of Hegel's logical enterprise depends on this point—the *range of the logically possible is obviously far more extensive than the range of what Kant called the "really possible."* The latter is what we need if we are to have a logic of the real. (Uncaused events are logically possible, but not really possible, something we know a priori.) And Hegel cannot avail himself of Kant's nonconceptual forms of intuition to establish a priori the sensible conditions that set the boundaries of "the really possible." As Kant conceived his project, it would make no sense to attempt to prove objective validity for synthetic a priori truths if such an appeal were not possible.

Transcendental logic, on the contrary, has a manifold of sensibility that lies before it a priori, which the transcendental aesthetic has offered to it, in order to provide the pure concepts of the understanding with a matter [*einen Stoff*], without which they would be without any content [*ohne allen Inhalt*], thus completely empty [*völlig leer*] . . . Only the spontaneity of our thought requires that this manifold first be gone through, taken up, and combined in a certain way in order for a cognition to be made out of it. I call this action synthesis. (CPR A77/B102)⁹²

92. The clear tension in Kant's position, of great importance for Hegel, can be seen by looking at A79/B105, the "same function" passage.

However, to pick a strange ally at this point, Peter Strawson demonstrated, in *The Bounds of Sense*, that the really possible *can* be determined without what he considered Kant's subjective idealism (the subjective forms of intuition), and this—revealingly for our purposes—by a reflection on whether a candidate notion of experience *could be said to make sense*. Moreover, the key issue in Hegel's account is not logical contradiction and logical possibility, but the possibility of the intelligible determinacy of nonempirical conceptual content, the categories without which there could not be intelligible (i.e., determinable) objects. Strawson would also point out that Kant already seems to assume that he is showing how the minimal intelligibility of judgment could not be possible without the twelve moments of the table of pure concepts. That is already a kind of determination of the really possible. Kant, however, does not provide the arguments for such a deduction.

Moreover, the following sort of formulation in Kant is one of those that directly counter what Hegel believes to be the unfortunate general tendency in the *Critique* to consider concepts as subjective classifications that we apply to exogenously received content, requiring that we wonder whether they “fit” in individual cases and whether the nonderived classifications of conceptual powers have anything to do with, can rightly be “imposed on,” such content.⁹³ (I do not mean that this impositionism is Kant's view; I mean that Hegel, in his critical moments, fastens onto passages that could suggest that [as have generations of commentators] and does not think through passages like the following.) Here, in this formulation, there is no content except as constituted by the logical form of judgment, and so no strict separation between general and transcendental logic.

The same function that gives unity to various representations in a judgment also gives unity to the mere [*bloße*] synthesis of representations in an intuition, which, expressed generally, is called the pure concept of the understanding. The same understanding, therefore, and indeed *by the very same actions* through which it brings the logical form of a judgment into concepts by means of the analytic unity, also brings a transcendental content [*einen transzendentalen Inhalt*] into its representation by means of the synthetic unity of the manifold in general. On account of which they are

93. Hegel can himself sound this way in his Jena years, especially in *Belief and Knowledge*. For an account of the differences between his mature and his early position, see Longuenesse (2007, 192–238).

called pure concepts of the understanding that pertain to objects a priori; this can never be accomplished by universal logic. (CPR A79/B105)⁹⁴

It is not easy to know what Kant means by “brings a transcendental content into its representation by means of the synthetic unity of the manifold in general,” but in the broadest sense, what Kant says is certainly true. Universal or general logic cannot determine *which* predicates belong with *which* subjects, which events are necessarily succeeded by which events. We cannot determine what are real, concrete “synthetic unities” merely by thinking of some. But if we take “the same function” seriously, then the specifications of the logical forms of unity in a judgment *just thereby* specify what Kant is calling here, somewhat mysteriously, “transcendental content.” The passage brings us very close to formulations frequent in the *Logic*: that the concept gives itself its own actuality. The “same function” passage could even be read as a gloss on that claim.⁹⁵

This would not of course mean that we could not still broadly mark out a formal logic in the sense of, say, forms of valid logical inference, which, when instantiated by variables, will yield valid results.⁹⁶ It is just to say that the link between such inferential and conceptual forms and forms of the thought of objects is a close and a priori one. (Kant is interested in this connection but limits himself to the parallelism between the tables of the logical functions of judgment and the table of categories. To reiterate the point made earlier: the very fact that there is such a parallelism—why should there be?—is already an indication of a deeper connection.) That deeper connection means that such forms are, *at the same time*, possible forms of well-formed judgments and proper inferences *and* forms of the thought of objects, of objects considered in their intelligibility. These latter constitute all that objects could be, are the forms of objects, and without Kant’s “only for us” restriction, because without his reliance on nonconceptual forms of sensibility to establish that claim.

94. For the most rigorous and thoughtful exploration of what this and many similar passages appear to commit Kant to, see the first seven chapters in McDowell (2009, 3–146).

95. See Hegel’s remarks at *SL* 21.28 and 21.30–31; *EL* §41, no. 2. The contrast with Kant is clearest at *EL* §24, where Hegel says the relation between concept, judgment, and syllogism to issues like causality can be established only *in* logic, and not, by implication, by connecting a transcendental aesthetic with a transcendental logic. One can also note that Kant himself tells us what an object is in a way that sounds Hegelian: an “object is that in the concept of which the manifold is united” (B137). Finally, in Kant’s Refutation of Idealism argument, Kant claims to show that any notion of an internally apprehended sense is object-involving.

96. See Wolff’s (2013) discussion.

Kant seems to think that he is faced with two exclusive alternatives. Either concepts, qua concepts, have objects, or their objects are provided exogenously. The former is the case only for *logical* content; the latter is necessary if we are trying understand any power of *knowledge*. Hegel is providing a third alternative: that a strict separability between concept and intuitively apprehended object is impossible, even though the notions are distinguishable. To establish the conceptually necessary is to establish the really possible, if we have understood the establishing of conceptual necessity properly, differently than Kant. The forms of the thought of an object can be considered the forms of objects (in Kantian language the forms of sensibility) if it can be shown that the thought of anything at all, any way of making sense, would fail without some form or other. And so Kant's appeal to the form of the extraconceptual as if to a distinct contributor is misleading and unnecessary.

Hegel agrees with this remark by Kant, in other words, just disagreeing that Kant must then go on to prove that there must be such manifolds.

The pure categories, however, are nothing other than presentations of things insofar as the manifold of their intuition must be thought through one or another of these logical functions. (CPR A245/B303)

Kant of course wants that reference to the "manifold of intuition" to be doing some necessary, extra-general logic work, especially in the transcendental deduction of the second edition. For example, when we realize that such a manifold has a pure, nonconceptual form, time, we have a way of showing how categories provided by the understanding from itself could be the forms of objects that exist independent of thought. By being modes of time-consciousness, they are thereby the forms of any intuitable content and can be considered extraconceptually as a way of getting into view all possible sensible content. But for Hegel this specification of content by thinking of the temporal modality of its forms must be a *further specification by thought of its own activity*.⁹⁷ Otherwise the question of the relation of forms of thought to objects turns out to have a quasi-empirical answer. The answer would have

97. John McDowell (2009) has argued that Kant did not need "completion" by Hegel to see this point himself, that in the B Deduction "the essential move is to deny that the Transcendental Aesthetic offers an independent condition for objects to be given to our senses" (73). I think there are passages that certainly suggest that Kant saw the problems caused by too strict a separation between intuition and concept, but by and large he bit the separability bullet and accepted the "subjective," ignorance-of-things-in-themselves idealism Hegel charged him with.

to be: the forms of thought relate to objects “for creatures built like us.”⁹⁸ More broadly, we can say that Mary Tiles is right that “categories are the concepts which *frame* objects in this way.” For me this means categories alone. They do this already, as forms, without reliance on extraconceptual forms of sensibility.⁹⁹

By contrast, Kant’s view, again, seems to be that, first, all thinkings, all representations, have intensional content (are simply about something), so it is possible to consider pure thinkings in terms not just of intensional content (as subjects of which predicates may be predicated) but also of real or objective content (substances and properties).¹⁰⁰ We can thus formulate possible candidates for “categories.” For Hegel we are thereby already in the heart of speculative philosophy. But since we are for Kant dependent in experience on nonconceptual forms of intuition, these must be merely *putative*

98. This is what McDowell (2009, 76) calls Kant’s tendency to refer to our forms of intuition as “brute facts” about us. I do not see how the position given to Kant by Rödl in 2006 avoids this problem. I agree with him that general logic must be understood as transcendental logic if it is adequately to characterize the forms of thought. This is something like being able to understand the pure idea of an object of thought as ultimately *amounting to* the idea of something in space and time. (Ultimately because for Hegel, this requires that we understand a part of his *Realphilosophie*, his Philosophy of Nature. It is not a concern of logic proper.) But the key point is that this congruence of general and transcendental logic should be explained by showing *how general logic already is transcendental logic*, not how it “becomes” transcendental by the introduction of the pure form of extraconceptual content. (Stated that way, what could that be except a McDowellian brute fact?) Or at least, I believe that is the Hegelian position, what is behind his critique of Kant’s subjective idealism.

In 2008, Rödl presents his own view of what, in effect, Kant without thought constrained by the pure forms of intuition would look like: Hegel’s *Science of Logic*. But his criticism of McDowell in this article does not seem to me to make contact with McDowell’s concerns. “*Eliminating externality*” is not the right summary phrase and suggests the sort of criticism of McDowell made by Friedman and others. The real problem is the *status* of the forms of intuition as something like species characteristics, “brute facts.” What we want to eliminate is *this* sort of appeal. The whole issue of identifying category and schema makes sense only within Kant’s account of the twin sources of knowledge as separate and needing to be joined together.

99. Tiles 2004, 109. See also her interesting suggestion that a transcendental logic understood this way could count “delimitation of domains of possible interpretation as being within its scope.” *Ibid.*

100. Although Hegel clearly objects to the misleading implications of Kant’s formulation of a “contentless” logic:

But, first, to say that logic abstracts from all content, that it only teaches the rule of thinking without being able to engage in what is being thought or to take its composition into consideration, this alone is already inadequate. For, since thinking and the rules of thinking are supposed to be its subject matter, in these logic already has a content specifically its own; in them it has that second constituent of knowledge, namely a matter whose composition is its concern. (21.28)

categories. We cannot know without further ado that or how such “transcendental content” bears on content so enformed. (Because of the independent status of pure forms of intuition, there is supposed to be no guarantee that sensible objects *can* be possible objects of the understanding, whatever the understanding’s “own” content is.) The “further ado” (in this traditional way of reading Kant) is the transcendental deduction, after which we supposedly know that in our experience there are, must be, substances in the sense of that which is permanent through time and alterations, underlying such change, in which properties inhere. This, supposedly, proves that transcendental content is not *merely* intensional, that objects sensibly apprehended correspond to it. But again, if Kant’s own indications that there cannot be any strict separability between concept and intuition hold, the strategy is misconceived. This is, I believe, Hegel’s claim, and partly explains why the *SL* looks the way it does.¹⁰¹ Kant thinks: we cannot know that there is anything that instantiates what the pure categories determine—substances, say. We need the Deduction to establish that there is, since the forms of thought cannot but determine what could be an object (not, as he is sometimes taken to mean, what “can be made into an object by us”). If we take Kant’s question to be simply how do we know there are objects at all, then that is not a question either Kant or Hegel is interested in. It is a question that depends on assump-

101. See Prolegomena §9 (Kant 1997) for clear formulations of the issue in these terms. I am indebted to Tolley (forthcoming) for much of this formulation. He does not, though, connect the general and transcendental logic problem with the concept-intuition issue in this way. This makes it harder to state the full Kantian position, which I believe is the one formulated above, and it leaves open to the Kantian the response that, because of Hegel’s neglect of that issue, the inextricable intertwining of thought and content/object that Tolley rightly sees is the core of Hegel’s doctrine of “the idea” could look just like a doctrine of “*thought-contents*,” something that does not get us to logic as “metaphysics” (unless the world is made up of abstract entities, *Wesenheiten*, subject terms and predicate terms, not substances and properties). We would have a science of what “is there for thought,” but that content still sounds like “thought-things.” Tolley wants Kant committed to an act/content/object distinction (which I consider a kind of “Brentano/Husserl” version of Kant) in order to insist that there is some *difference of content* between the thought of a hundred possible thalers and the thought of a hundred actually intuited thalers. But Hegel can concede that there is a difference between imagining a hundred thalers and having them, without any such distinct intuitive capacity “adding” anything to the *conceptual content*. The possibility of *that* content is just actualized. This is, I try to argue in Pippin (2013b), a Sellarsian position that helps clarify both Kant and Hegel on form-content. (Problematic for Tolley’s reading of Kant: “The actual contains no more than the merely possible” [A599/B627].) Moreover the direction in which Tolley is going threatens to reintroduce somewhere a notion of sense as standing between the mind and the world, instead of treating, say, a demonstrative expression as a mode of presentation. See Evans (1985, 302–3), and the discussion in Redding (2007, 45–46).

tions they would both reject. (It is like assuming that trying to determine the possible objects of thought by thought insures that we will end up only with objects-as-thought, not objects as they are. Hegel makes clear in many places what he thinks of this willful suicide by thought.)¹⁰²

That is, when Hegel tries to explain what, by contrast, *he* means by “introducing content” into “logic,” he makes clear he is not talking about the great multitude of empirical content, the intuited manifold, or just about thought-content in the sense of logical content, like subject-predicate. He says something that will require much clarification later.

By thus introducing content into logical consideration, it is not the things, but what is rather the fact [*Sache*], the concept of the things, that becomes the subject matter. (*SL* 21.17)

“Fact” doesn’t help much as a translation; he doesn’t seem to mean anything like *Tatsache*, or what is the case. He is moving in the opposite direction from anything empirical, anything having to do with things or facts about existence. He becomes a little clearer when he says about the concept of such a content,

This concept is not intuited by the senses, is not represented in imagination; it is only subject matter [*Gegenstand*], the product and content of thought, the fact that exists in and for itself [*die an und für sich seyende Sache*], the logos, the reason of that which is, the truth of what we call things; it is least of all the logos that should be kept outside the science of logic. (21.17)¹⁰³

102. A clear statement of Hegel’s objections to Kant’s treatment of the problem of content in logic:

Here accordingly we have again the supposition that apart from the manifoldness of intuition the concept is without content, empty, despite the fact that the concept is said to be a synthesis a priori; as such, it surely contains determinateness and differentiation within itself. And because this determinateness is the determinateness of the concept, and hence the absolute determinateness, singularity, the concept is the ground and the source of all finite determinateness and manifoldness. (12.23)

103. “This objective thinking is thus the content of pure science. Consequently, far from being formal, far from lacking the matter required for an actual and true cognition, it alone has absolute truth, or, if one still wanted to make use of the word “matter,” which alone is the veritable matter—a matter for which the form is nothing external, because this matter is rather pure thought and hence the absolute form itself” (21.34).

This “reason of that which is” means that Hegel cannot be talking about logical content (like “subject term,” “disjunct,” or “antecedent”), and that is stressed in other ways throughout the *SL* and in the *EL*.

When thinking is taken as active with regard to objects as the thinking over [*Nachdenken*] of something, then the universal—as the product of this activity—contains the value of the matter [*Wert der Sache*], what is essential [*das Wesentliche*], inner, true. (*EL* §21)

Throughout passages like this, Hegel is distinguishing the question of actuality, the proper subject matter of the *Logic*, from questions about existence, and we will see that distinction at work often. In the *EL* §6, he defines the content of philosophy proper as “actuality” and distinguishes it from the merely apparent, transient, and insignificant. (The immediate temptation to think of this as a two-world theory is a powerful one. Resisting it requires remembering the enormous importance of Aristotle for Hegel and Aristotle’s rejection of Plato’s two-world metaphysics.) In the *Philosophy of Right*, he begins with a reminder he repeats often, that such a study consists neither in the mere analysis of the concept of right, nor in an empirical account of existing institutions, but in an account of the concept together with its actuality, where the latter is distinguished from “external contingency, untruth, deception, etc.” (*PR* §1).

It is the kind of issue that arises when we ask if some practice is “really” or “actually” religious—peyote smoking, say. We don’t doubt that the practice exists; we want to know its “essentiality,” *Wert, Sache an sich selbst*, and so forth.¹⁰⁴ We don’t doubt that animals exist; we want to know if they are actually rights bearers. We know computers can play chess and win, perhaps one day could even pass Turing tests, but we want to know not whether these facts are true, but whether the computer is “actually” thinking. In a more familiar, recent example, a gallery opens, and objects, pieces of clothing, say, are exhibited strewn about the floor. It is called art, but we want to know, is it actually art? Or we could ask, what actually is an object of experience?

104. Why Hegel adds to this list, which is reminiscent of such Greek notions as *to alēthes*, *to ontōs on*, and the like, the notion of value (*Wert*) must await treatment of the logic of the Concept. But we can note, with Mure (1940), who tries to show that Hegel was committed to the identity of the ultimately real, the intelligible, and the good, Hegel’s reanimation of the Platonic and Aristotelian view that the world was, in actuality, *good*—good in that it was intelligible, allowed our demand for intelligibility to be met, and good in that that intelligibility was the manifestation of a kind of “genuineness,” or even perfection, a thing fully intelligible if fully what it was to be that thing. See also Lear 1988, chaps. 1, 2, and 6.

And we might answer, “that in the concept of which the manifold is united.” As Quine pointed out, the answer to the question “What is there?” is easy: everything. But not everything is actual.¹⁰⁵

Hegel’s impatience with those who think that his project aims to demonstrate that everything that exists, everything contingent, is really necessary boils over in §6 of the introduction to the *Encyclopedia*. He refers to his famous “Doppelsatz” in the preface to the *Philosophy of Right* (that what is rational is actual and what is actual is rational), and he notes explicitly that what exists certainly exists contingently and “*can just as well not be*,” and he refers us to the *Logic* for the right explication of what is “actual” by contrast with what merely exists. He adds, “Who is not smart enough to be able to see around him quite a lot that is not, in fact, how it ought to be?” (We can come to understand what a state actually is, though no such state exists.) Yet despite Hegel’s waving this huge bright flag inscribed, “I believe in contingency!” one still hears often (even from scholars of German philosophy) that his philosophy is an attempt to deduce the necessity of everything from the Prussian state to Krug’s fountain pen.¹⁰⁶

With right qualifications in place, what Hegel means by actuality and all its synonyms (which will crucially include “essence,” to be discussed in chapter 6) is congruent with what Kant meant by categoriality. Consider this claim from the *Phenomenology*:

The category which otherwise signified the essentiality of what exists where it was indeterminate if “what exists” signified the essentiality of what exists per se or signified what exists as confronting consciousness, is now the essentiality, that is, the simple unity of what exists merely as a thinking actuality. Or, to put it differently, the category is this: Self-consciousness and being are the same essence, that is, the same not in comparison with each other, but rather the same in and for itself. (*PhG* §235)

Seeing it this way helps explain his otherwise bewildering claim that the concept (in this sense) *gives itself* its own actuality. This has nothing to do with some Neoplatonic self-causing process, out of which concepts pop, like

105. The ancient distinction is the one Hegel is after, not an account of *on*, inseparable as it is from *mē on* (*Schein*); we want rather *ontōs on*. And in this context, that will require that we understand the logic of the truth-seeming relationship, not at all the same problem as understanding the relation between nature’s and spirit’s seemings and their truth.

106. For a good account of the issue and the legions of misinterpretations, see Vieweg (2012, 23–30).

toast from a toaster. The claim means: the sort of questions posed above are in no sense empirical questions, answerable by some fact of the matter. If that is so, there is no reason we cannot speak Hegelese, and say that thought determines for itself what is actual, gives itself its own actuality. How then to account for the *determinate* actualities treated in the *Logic*? In answering this Hegel seems to place a lot of faith in some sort of derivability of such essentialities from the conditions for the possibility of discursive intelligibility as such.¹⁰⁷ The paradigmatic form of such sense-making is predicative: paradigmatically (but only paradigmatically, not exclusively), assertoric categorical judgments. We shall see how and why his attempt differs a great deal from Kant's similar one in the Metaphysical Deduction, but the point now is the similarity. The Concept gives itself its own actuality. The answers to any type of question like those posed above are not empirical. Empirical questions depend on, would not be possible without, the determination of the *intelligibly actual*. (Later we will see Hegel trace out the answer to the question of actuality by considering the most influential one, Aristotle's. What gives actuality is form, the logos of essence. So understood, actuality, *Wirklichkeit*, is Aristotle's *energeia*. As Hegel says in his *History of Philosophy* lectures, "actuality means being at work [*Am Werke Sein*], activity [*Tätigkeit*].")¹⁰⁸

It is true that all of this can seem a radical departure from Kant, for whom concepts stand in no immediate relation to objects, are in that relation only as mediated by other representations. But this is true only superficially. The concept of any object at all, for example, is not a concept of a content that could be given to us, any more than the concept of nature could be. Yet reason provides a content to that concept of nature (possible objects of sensory experience), which content it has only by being thought to have such a content. How pure thinking could be said to provide an ever more determinate content for the concept of any possible object is something we will see Hegel addressing in chapter 5.¹⁰⁹

To note this though about what it might mean to say that a concept "gives itself" its own actuality touches on a larger, similar problem that will emerge

107. A summary statement of how this works in general is given by Rödl (2008): "How then do we find the pure concepts, and how do we limit their application? Both tasks are linked as follows: we find one pure concept as what limits another" (10).

108. Rohs (1982, 28); See also JA 18: 78, 85.

109. Kant provides it in the second half of the B Deduction, arguing that the only possible content for the concept of an object in general is sensible and intuitive, ultimately as modes of time consciousness.

in several different ways in what follows. I have said that Hegel agrees with Kant that thinking is basically discursive. But that has to be immediately qualified. Understood as Kant does, it means that thought can give itself *no* content, *only* think about content “supplied” *extraconceptually*. Thinking is not, in this tradition, a receptive power. Kant reasoned that the only available sort of extraconceptual receptivity known to us is sensible; hence the fundamentality of the concept–(sensible) intuition divide. If that is the inference, then “*the discursivity of thought thesis*” immediately prohibits anything anywhere near the neighborhood of a “*concept gives itself its own actuality*” thesis, where actuality means something like the categorical essence of things, that without which they couldn’t be what they are, and not the logically actual in Kant’s sense. Such a prohibition is the whole point of the discursivity claim. (This would not exhaust all the alternatives if by thinking, thought could produce, in the sense of create, its own objects—if there were “intellectual intuition,” something Kant reserves only for God. It is thus understandable that for some commentators when Hegel speaks of concepts giving themselves their own actuality, he must be referring to Absolute Spirit’s self-realization.)

But for Hegel, while this seems to be as great a difference as imaginable, it is not. Kant had already himself indicated that discursive thought must have an “intuitive moment” in itself in being able to lay out the elements of the Metaphysical Deduction.¹¹⁰ Thought must be able to determine its own moments or form, not conceptualize an alien content. There can be no great tension in the two claims, because Kant is quite interested in what he says our “cognitive faculty . . . provides out of itself” (CPR B1). According to Hegel, Kant did not have a handle on his own thinking and seemed to pick up the categories from logic textbooks, but the fact that the concept of judgment itself could, at least putatively, “determine itself” in these moments already gives Hegel his stalking horse. This moment is not anything like “seeing” thought’s nature as an object; it is spontaneous. Kant is very clear that “Reason has insight only into that which it produces after a plan of its own,” and the results in the *Critique of Pure Reason* are “produced” by reason itself. But neither is this activity the discursive application of a predicate to a concept

110. See Koch (2014) on Hegel’s dissolution of the strict opposition between *noēsis* and *dianoia*, between a distinctly intuitive and distinctly discursive moment in thought. He concludes, “die Spekulation ist de diskursiv artikuliert intellektuelle Anschauung, und ihre Diskursform ist die Dialektik” (279). Given the history of the term, “intellektuelle Anschauung” can be misleading, but I agree with the basic point.

of an object. What we know is what we know in exercising reason, what we know in judging. It is also the case that Kant himself had already showed, made the “logical point” in his account of space and time as both forms of intuition and pure intuitions, that a form could be a form of apprehension and itself a content at the same time. In the addition to EL §41, Hegel remarks that Kant himself, in formulating reason’s critique of itself, treats forms of cognition as objects of cognition, thus being committed to the unity of “the activity of the forms of thinking” and “the critique of them.” He calls this feat “dialectic.” Mathematical construction in mathematical proof makes essentially the same point, although the points about pure intuition are only analogues of the general point Hegel would want to make and are not invoked as such in the *Logic*. And most suggestively for the entire enterprise of the *Logic*, practical reason can determine the form of a rational will that is also itself a substantive content. The self-legislation of the moral law is not volitional anarchy but practical reason’s knowledge of “what” to legislate. It “legislates” in being practical reason reasoning about what ought to be done. It legislates because in knowing what ought to be done it is not affected by some object, “what is to be done,” about which it judges. It determines, produces, what is to be done.¹¹¹ Said more simply, when one makes a promise, one legislates into existence a promise. One is bound only by binding oneself. This does not mean that we also legislate *what it is* to be bound, but that too is a self-determination of reason, a formulation by reason of itself, not the discovery or grasp of a content. Being bound is the concept of being bound, applied to oneself. (While it is true that the self-legislation of the moral law can serve as a fine example of what it is for a concept to give itself its own content, as it did for Fichte—practical reason determines the content of practical reason as itself, as the form of practical reason—Kant also holds that while we must acknowledge this, must concede its necessity, we have no way of understanding how practical reason determines, realizes, what is to be done.¹¹² This is a

111. This is certainly not the end of this story. Koch (2014, 134), in the chapter “Sein-Wesen-Begriff,” also argues that for Hegel pure thinking, the subject matter of the logic, must be both discursive and intuitive. But my point here is this must be carefully put. It does not mean that pure thinking contemplates a distinct noetic structure or that it merely “observes” its own productions. What it does mean involves a certain form of inseparable “immediacy” attendant on thought’s self-negation throughout the *Logic*.

112. We *could* understand it if we could understand how the end of happiness, the necessary end of a sensible being, could be understood as consistent with what pure practical reason demands, but we can do this only by *postulating* a solution, by the postulates of a just God and

form of thought—"must acknowledge but do not finally understand"—that often occasions Hegel's impatience.)

For another thing, the methodology of the *SL* itself must be respected. Thought's self-determination in the course of the book makes no reference to the Absolute's self-consciousness in order to explain anything. As we shall see in the next chapter, and when we look at the opening moves of the *SL*, the "intuitive" moment in discursive thought is tied up with Hegel's interpretation of the apperceptive character of discursive thought. The simplest summary would be that Hegel thinks of such self-consciousness as inherently *self-transcending* as well, or as implying a kind of possible achievement of full or absolute reflection.¹¹³ Any thinking of a content is inherently reflexive in a way that Hegel thinks will allow him to derive from the possible thought of anything at all notions like something and finitude, and ultimately essence, appearance, even the idea of the good. (So, contra Kant on what we might call thought's absolute discursivity, Hegel thinks that thought is always already giving itself its own content: itself, where that means, roughly, deter-

the immortality of the soul. This is hardly a solution for Hegel since these are also not knowable. Perhaps the passage that would be most puzzling for Hegel would be Kant (2000, 71), where Kant notes that we are "delighted [*erfreuet*] (strictly speaking relieved of a need)" when we encounter a "systematic unity among merely empirical laws, just as if it were a happy accident which assumed to favor our aims," but goes on to say that we have had to assume there was such a unity (apparently whether we find one or not), yet "without having been able to gain insight into it and prove it."

113. This is Mure's (1940, 100–114) phrase, and his discussion of these issues in general is very helpful. I do not, however, agree with his account of Hegelian thought "dominating" all contingency, and I do not understand the passages where the sobriety and lucidity of his account cease and he says such things as "Absolute Spirit is the concrete identity of subject and object in a timelessly self-consummating activity" (132). I try to explain what the notion of self-consciousness as a *self-transcending accomplishment* might involve in the *Phenomenology of Spirit* in Pippin (2010). This argument involves attributing to the structure of self-consciousness a teleological dimension, an internal conatus or drive for unity. This can sound peculiar (one must not do anything, achieve anything, to be self-conscious), but Hegel's topic in this section of the *PhG* is not my mere awareness of being a thinking subject, but just this problem of unity. His overall claim is no more odd than Kant's view that merely "conditioned" knowledge is unsatisfactory as such, is possible only within a kind of conatus, an unavoidable "desire" (to use Hegel's word) for completion and successful unification. Here is Hegel's "logical" formulation of the issue.

Internal self-movement, self-movement proper, drive in general (the appetite or *nisus* of the monad, the entelechy of the absolutely simple essence) is likewise nothing else than that something is, in itself, itself and the lack of itself (the negative), in one and the same respect. Abstract self-identity is not yet vitality; but the positive, since implicitly it is negativity, goes out of itself and sets its alteration in motion. Something is alive, therefore, only to the extent that it contains contradiction within itself: indeed, force is this, to hold and endure contradiction within. (11.287)

mining that without which it could not be a thought of an object, something that is itself “identical” to the determination of any intelligible, any object.) But all this can count now only as previews of coming attractions.

Finally, the question of whether Hegel thereby means to say that, contra Hume, for example, a world in which there are no necessary connections between events is logically impossible is impossible to answer in that form. We could say: if we entertain an abstraction, in which we consider the thinkable as such, independent of *any* relation to objects, and if we consider any particular possibility as an isolated one, in itself, we could say, in that sense such a world would be logically possible. But Hegel would deny that this is a philosophically significant result. Thinking is by its nature object-related, and the logical possibility of any one potentiality depends for its determinability on entertaining a great many other presuppositions and implications, and when viewed in that way, in that sense of logic, the answer is no, such a world is not possible. (Hegel’s appeal to the totality of these presuppositions, implications, exclusions in this sense functions like Kant’s appeal to the possibility that experience can “control” what Kant would call “real possibilities.”) Hegel does not get this claim for free, of course, but it is what he is trying to show.

The suggestion is that Hegel thinks of anything’s principle of intelligibility, its conceptual form, as an actualization in the Aristotelian sense, the being-at-work or *energeia* of the thing’s distinct mode of being, not a separable immaterial metaphysical object. In understanding Hegel on this point, we should take fully on board the form-matter, actuality-potentiality language of Aristotle, and so the most interesting kind of hylomorphism, soul-body hylomorphism, as our way of understanding this nonseparateness claim. In the standard analogy (from Aristotle’s *De Anima*), if the eye were body (matter), *seeing*, the power of sight, would be its soul (form), the distinct way of the being-at-work or first actuality of its body. There is thus no true separability (even if distinguishability); a “dead” eye is not an eye anymore, except homonymously.

So in a human sensibly receptive creature, to appeal to that example, subject to sensory impressions, specific conceptual intuitings (this-suches) would be the distinctive actuality, the distinctive being-at-work of such a capacity. To think that for creatures like us, we must distinguish the sensory manifold from the form that informs it is the great temptation to be avoided for Hegel. The power of the eye to see is not a power “added” to a material eye, as if there could be an eye identical in all respects to a normal

eye but unable to see, that was then “infused” with the seeing power. The seeing power *is* the distinct being-at-work of that body. The form-content model central to Hegel’s account of logical formality works the same way.¹¹⁴

And “in us” as well, it is the actualization of a conceptual power, an actualization that is not in the nonspeculative sense identical with, the same as, the being-at-work in the thing (the thing is not trying to make itself intelligible) but that is, in the right understanding of that being-at-work, its actualization in thought, that is actualized in being and that is the principle of its intelligibility. This can be understood in the same way that, according to Aristotle, in sense perception there can be a single “actualization” of two distinct potentialities, in the perceptible and in the perceiver.¹¹⁵ Or, with the proper qualifications, it can be expressed as Kant would about categories: that, for example, causality refers as much to a way of understanding as to a feature of any possibly intelligible world. So it is perfectly appropriate to say such things as that for Hegel reality “has a conceptual structure” or “only concepts are truly real,” as long as we realize we are talking not about entities, much less separable, immaterial abstract entities, but about the “actualities” of beings, their modes or ways of being what determinately and intelligibly they are. To say that “any object is the concept of itself” is to say that what it is in being at work being what it is can be determined, has a logos, and this is the other side of the coin “every judging is the consciousness of itself as judging,” as will be explored in the next chapter. We can say that reality comes to self-consciousness about itself in us, or that the light that illuminates beings in their distinct being-at-work is the same light that illuminates their know-

114. It is easy to miss the general significance of this account of actuality, but Hegel uses it in this Aristotelian sense often. For example, when he is introducing the “essence” of spirit in the *PhG*, he reminds us of all the elements in consciousness, self-consciousness, and reason we have traversed, that is, their “advance and retreat into their ground and essence,” and goes on to say that this *essence* “is just this movement and resolution of these moments” (§440). There is a long story behind this. It descends not only from Aristotle, but from Kant’s claim that the unity of apperception is just the bringing of elements to a unity (in a concept), and it can be seen even in Heidegger’s claim that Dasein is just having its being as Dasein at issue. These are all formulations that can seem initially paradoxical.

115. Cf. Mure 1940, 23. And compare Hegel’s formulation in the *PhG*.

Or, to put it differently, the category is this: Self-consciousness and being are the same essence, that is, the same not in comparison with each other, but rather the same in and for itself. It is merely a one-sided, bad idealism, which lets this unity once again come on the scene as consciousness on one side and an in-itself confronting it on the other side. (§236)

ability in us, as long as we do not mean a light emanating from individual minds.¹¹⁶

And here again, Hegel's model of metaphysics, as is indicated by his frequent invocation of the German term for *energeia*, *Wirklichkeit*, is Aristotelian. And Aristotle's metaphysics is not modern dogmatic metaphysics, does not concern a "supersensible" reality knowable only by pure reason. In many respects it is a metaphysics of the ordinary: standard sensible objects, especially organic living beings and artifacts. This means that in many respects Kant's critique of rationalist metaphysics in effect "misses" it, or intersects with it only marginally. Aristotle, for the most part, is interested not in the special, nonsensible objects that Kant (or Plato) was concerned with,¹¹⁷ but in the intelligibility conditions of ordinary objects. To say this is not to say that he is interested just in epistemology or the priority of epistemology. It is to say, as Hegel would, that he is interested not simply in how we make sense of things, but in how things are such that they can be made sense of, and why the questions could not be separated. Hegel's project, I am trying to suggest, has much more to do with this enterprise than with either a Neoplatonist theory of reality or an attempt to determine the furniture of the universe available only to pure reason, like a monistic substance or monads or ideas.

He has his problems with Aristotle. He would not say that the mind can in some way "*become* all things," or he has difficulties with any sort of passive intellectual intuition, but the similarities are much more important.¹¹⁸ And in his *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, Hegel "Hegelianizes" Aristotle

116. See Falk (1983, 170–71) for a good statement of this point. When Horstmann (2017) says that objects must be understood in Hegel as "constituted by their own conceptual activity," that concepts are "active principles within subjects," and so that objects are, for Hegel, subjects (132), I take him not to mean that Hegel thinks objects are thinking or conscious, but to be referring to what he later calls a "modernized version of Aristotle's conception of objects as entelechies" (133). I understand that in the manner defended in this chapter, but I am not sure Horstmann does. His formulations sometimes make it hard to understand how Hegel deals with the availability of such objects to self-conscious rational subjects, as if the latter is not a Hegelian question. See his characterization of Hegel "exporting (as it were) the object-forming conceptual principles out of the human subject and importing them into the Concept as the internal ground of the being of the object" (135). I think Hegel's position is more like Aristotle's: substantial form is actualized in the object and in the subject.

117. For a famous example, Aristotle denied a special realm of mathematical objects; mathematics is concerned with "the changing objects of the natural world." Lear 1988, 231–32.

118. See Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 1.2, 2.19; and *Metaphysics* 7.7, 1027b13–30. Cf. Mure 1940, 166.

to minimize these differences. When he is explaining the Aristotelian notion of form (*eidos*) as actuality (*energeia*, *Wirklichkeit*), he says about this actualizing activity that

this principle of liveliness [*Lebendigkeit*], of subjectivity—not in the sense of a contingent, only particular subjectivity, but of pure subjectivity—is essentially Aristotle's position. (JA 18, 319–20)¹¹⁹

We also have to note again locutions like “the product of thought,” and “the product of this activity” with reference to the concept. Concepts cannot be said to be simply apprehended in themselves, to possess content that is simply grasped. He says that all development in the *Phenomenology* and *Logic* “rests exclusively on the nature of the pure essentialities that constitute the content of the logic” (SL 21.8).

In EL §20, Hegel again discusses this *Produkt* language and says that the subject matter of the *Logic* will be thinking (*Denken*), understood as an activity (*Tätigkeit*), which means that thinking is the “active universal” (*das tätige Allgemeine*) or the “self-activating” (*sich betätigende*) universal, because the deed (*Tat*) or that brought about (*Hervorgebrachte*) is the universal (*das Allgemeine*). He then goes on at length to distinguish this understanding from a psychological notion of thinking as a mental activity.

These formulations can be fully understood only in the terms of the logic of the Concept, but they also introduce us to elements of Hegel's idealism that should be kept in mind. That is, as is often pointed out by those who object to an interpretation of Hegel as what has come to be called, after Klaus Hartmann,¹²⁰ a category theorist, Hegel's aim in the *Logic* is *truth*, understood in the so-called “ontological sense.”¹²¹ His interest is in what really is, what there is “in truth,” what “*wahrhaftes Sein*” is, not what we are committed to in understanding the finite empirical world. And, according to Hegel, what there is in truth, that is, what “the Absolute” is, is the Idea, understood as the unity of concept and reality, or true actuality (*Wirklichkeit*). Finite existent objects do not count as what there is in truth because they do not fully correspond with their concept. For one thing, we tend to identify such finite objects with their “seemings,” their immediately givenness to common

119. See Roh's (1982, 29) discussion.

120. Hartmann 1976.

121. Horstmann 1984, 45.

sense. But we need an “essence-seeming” distinction to understand what is “in actuality.” (This is essentially what we are to conclude from the transition from a logic of being to a logic of essence.) Or, for another, to use Hegel’s own example, a “bad” house is not adequate to its concept, but it also is, or it would not be a house. It is in this sense, that it is both identical with itself, is what it is, and not identical with itself, is not what it is, that it exists in a kind of contradiction.¹²² This is why Hegel says, in the second addition to EL §24, that speculative truth is not the agreement of a judgment with some matter of fact, but the agreement of the concept with itself, and he cites as examples a true friend or a true work of art.

Moreover, as we shall see in the logic of essence, while it is true that one of Hegel’s grandest divisions is between positivism, a faith in the ultimate reality of the finite, and idealism, the contrary view, we have to be careful about the category of the finite.¹²³ By and large Hegel means to “denigrate” the *immediately given*, how things seem to common sense, *Schein*, or in general the finite. This has nothing to do with doubting the external reality of tables and molecules, any more than Marx’s claim that what seems earned wealth in capitalist society is really human labor means to deny that some people are wealthy.¹²⁴ And this suggestion that true reality resides in anything’s concept, that ultimate reality, the really real, consists in the reality of concepts in the Idea, or the concept of concepts, seems to indicate that we have in Hegel a recognizable “degrees of reality” Platonism. This impression is heightened in light of the fact that each finite concept, by virtue of being finite, does not perfectly express even its own concept (a particular horse is not “what horseness is”), much less conceptuality itself (full intelligibility,

122. As Theunissen (1978, 348) points out, this is already an indication that Hegel’s famous notion of contradiction does not violate Aristotle’s law of noncontradiction. The sense in which a man is not a man (not fully or perfectly what a man is) is not the same sense in which he is a man (the individual may be subsumed under that concept). This will be discussed further in chapter 4.

123. A clear formulation:

Finite things are finite because, and to the extent that they do not possess the reality of their concept completely within them but are in need of other things for it—or, conversely, because they are presupposed as objects and consequently the concept is in them as an external determination. (12.17)

124. This is Theunissen’s (1980, 142) example.

or what Hegel calls “absolute reflection”).¹²⁵ Or, what Hegel means by reality at some “lower level” is the manifestation of some defective intelligibility.

A traditional degrees-of-reality realism like this would leave unaccounted for all the references to subjectivity, the active universal, deeds, and that brought about (*hervorgebracht*). Concepts are supposed to be moments in the process of thought’s attempt to determine its own possibility (the possibility of thinking what is the case and so the forms of possible being), not apprehended realities, eidetic things. The point of Hegel’s denying to finite, empirical reality the gold standard badge of true actuality is not to say that it “possesses” a lesser degree of reality in the traditional sense (whatever that might mean). It is to say that finite objects *viewed in their finitude*, or considered as logical atoms, can never reveal the possibility of their own intelligibility. (The implication of this: the fullest, indeed, the absolute realization of being is the intelligibility of intelligibility itself, the concept of the concept.) An empirical attention to the finite details will provide us only with lists of

125. If one is not careful about this issue, one can end up attributing to Hegel views like: the modern understanding of nature is not incompatible with freedom because nature is “less real.” Here is an example of that mistake.

Therefore the problem of reconciling natural determinism with freedom—taking these as two, competing supposed realities—is a problem that does not arise in the first place. The realm of nature is not real in the same way that the realm of freedom is real . . . the realm of freedom wins and nature loses. (Wallace 2005, 10)

This is not what Hegel is defending and is also very difficult to understand in itself (winning and losing?). For one thing, one needs to distinguish between “actuality” and mere existence. For another the notion of less or more real can be extremely misleading. What Hegel is saying, as just noted, concerns the insufficiencies of taking the immediate given or the finite as real, and also is closer to Aristotle on why a heap is not a “true being” in the way an artifact or living being is, something that does not involve more or less. (See note 127.) In the next paragraph of the text, I offer a different interpretation of such claims by Hegel as “It is not the finite which is real, but the infinite” (21.136). But in the general picture I want to defend, nature is just as real as agency for Hegel. The question is what sort of account is adequate, “satisfying,” for what sort of events. I want to understand “degrees of reality” in terms of degrees of self-sufficient intelligibility, with the truly ideal being simply the self-determining Concept itself, thinking determining the necessary moments of pure thinking. So I *think* I agree with Stern (2009, 45–76) and his reading of what it means for Hegel to say that finite things cannot be characterized as “veritable being” (62, “ein Wahrhaft Seyendes”; this is Hegel’s phrase from his canonical statement of his idealism, 21.142), because they are not “self-sufficient or grounded in themselves.” But Stern’s account of such a “conceptual realism” seems to associate Hegel with a traditional doctrine of concept realism, and that is quite misleading. See as well Bowman’s (2013, 102–33, and especially 2017, 237–41) use of the thesis. So while there is an *ens realissimum* in Hegel (the concept or apperceptive spontaneity), it should not be construed in Platonist or medieval realist terms.

properties, successions of events, mere associations, nothing that would get us close to the basis of the possibility even of identifying those determinate properties and events. For that we need to understand such finite objects in the light of the concepts required for their intelligible apprehension and explanation, and we will never achieve that by empirical observation or, given Hegel's attack on immediacy in all its forms, by any intellectual intuition either. This process of thought's determination of its own possibility may still be—is—pretty vague, and the isolation and identification of the *necessary* moments of such self-determination will place a great deal of stress on that notion of necessity (and so on the process of internal self-negation by which they are identified), but those problems amount to the task Hegel's approach gives us. And this sort of interpretation allows one to see one sense in which it is close to Kant on the a priori specification of content exclusively by "thought," but without distinct, separable forms of receptivity, and without any appeal to an intuitive intellect "creating" everything it thinks by thinking, and without claiming anything about the "necessary passing-over of being-in-itself (substance) to being-for-itself (subject),"¹²⁶ and that is all we need for now. What these "essentialities" (*Wesenheiten*) are will obviously be a crucial question, but the earlier list of logical categories will give some idea.¹²⁷

As we shall see, this approach to Hegel's *SL* will make it possible to see Hegel not as relying on an appeal to a pure manifold of sense, on the assumption of separable forms of intuition, but rather as beginning to interrogate

126. Bowman 2013, 219. Bowman's interesting account, which I think of as basically Schellinian, is an "emergentist" account of thinking and is largely based on an analysis of paragraphs 54 and 55 of the preface to the *Phenomenology of Spirit*, and does not, in his crucial chapter (6) make much contact with the greater *Logic*. Theunissen (1980) is right to suggest throughout his study that if we really want to know what Hegel thinks of an objective "unreality of the finite idealism," we should look at his remarks on Plato and Aristotle in his *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*. Theunissen's (1980, 141–43) suggestion that we think of the charge of the "unreality of capital" in Marx is also quite helpful.

127. As with Aristotle, it will then be possible to concede that many things that exist are not actual, true beings, because not true unities, as are artifacts and living beings. For example Sellars (1967) imagines a sculptor responding to a question about what is in the corner, and saying "It isn't anything; it's just a piece of marble." As Sellars puts it, in Aristotle, "unless something is an artifact or a living thing, it is not a (changeable) being, but at best, material for beings" (78). Hegel would not put it this way. What plays the role of genuine unity in Aristotle is played by conceptual articulability in Hegel, but we get enough of a degrees-of-reality thesis to see what he might say that self-conscious subjectivity is at the very peak, the culmination of the process of conceptual articulation (pure thought thinking itself). See the end of the addition in EL §99 for a Hegelian hierarchy that leaves open the basis of the hierarchy, except to eliminate anything "quantitative."

the problem of possible determinacy of content by beginning with the mere possibility of the thought of anything at all: the thought, Being. But in keeping with the assumption that the primary unity of intelligibility is judgment, the act of asserting, Hegel does not mean that we entertain the concept as if grasping a content. The thinking of being requires what any thinking requires, an *act* of determination. But to see why that is so we need to understand another crucial orienting issue: the self-conscious or apperceptive nature of judging.

3

THE ROLE OF SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS IN *THE SCIENCE OF LOGIC*

Apperceptive Logic

This result returns us to the relation between Hegelian speculative logic and Kantian transcendental logic. Kant claimed in the *Prolegomena* that reliance on pure reason alone produced what he called mere *Schein*, illusion, not knowledge, that only experience (*Erfahrung*) produced knowledge.¹ (This is already misleadingly put by Kant, for we also, in some contexts, have no choice but to depend on pure reason alone, and the results have a certain kind of legitimacy.² We should say right away then that there is mere *Schein* and a *Schein* that is the “shining of essence.” More of that later.) For Hegel, the situation is exactly the reverse; experience is the realm of potential *Schein*, pure reason’s knowledge of itself the domain of speculative truth.³ But there is deeper agreement than disagreement between Kant and Hegel on “the logic of possible thinking” when one notes how much of what Kant wants to distinguish as general logic already relies, in his own words, on his transcendental theory, and so on the transcendental determination of possible content, what Hegel has called *die Sache*. To mention the point on which the

1. Kant 1997, 125–26.

2. He called this form of necessity “subjective,” as at A297/B354, or A680/B708, but that is also somewhat confusing because he occasionally uses that designation to refer to a Humean, psychological necessity. The subjective necessity of our being free or the necessity of judging some beings to be living is certainly not that.

3. Wolff 2013, 95.

heart of the theoretical issue between Kant and Hegel turns, in the *Critique* Kant writes,

And thus the synthetic unity of apperception is the highest point to which one must affix all use of the understanding, even the whole of logic and, after it, transcendental philosophy; indeed this faculty is the understanding itself. (B134n)⁴

This is tied to an even more general point:

I find that a judgment is nothing other than the way to bring given cognitions to the objective unity of apperception. That is the aim of the copula *is* in them: to distinguish the objective unity of representations from the subjective. For this word designates the relation of the representations to the original apperception and its necessary unity, even if the judgment itself is empirical, hence contingent, e.g., “Bodies are heavy.” By that, to be sure, I do not mean to say that these representations necessarily belong to one another in the empirical intuition, but rather that they belong to one another in virtue of the necessary unity of the apperception in the synthesis of intuitions, i.e. in accordance with the principles of the objective determination of all representations insofar as cognition can come from them, which principles are all derived from the principle of the transcendental unity of apperception. (B142)

This is a new theory of judgment and accordingly grounds a new logic. It is hardly an elaboration of what was always known in logic. So Béatrice Longuenesse is right when she writes,

Kant asked himself which logical forms of judgment should be considered primitive if the original function of judgment is to ‘bring given cognitions to the objective unity of apperception,’ that is, to relate our representations to objects. In this sense the transcendental question must have had

4. “Even the whole of logic” in this passage is crucial. Hegel will understand the logic of apperception, the distinct sort of self-relation involved, which he will call “infinite,” to be, when all is said and done, the basic structure of “the concept” or of any possible conceiving, and it is an absolutely general form of intelligibility, not limited to an understanding of exogenously given content.

a key role in the establishment of a systematic table of the logical forms of judgment.⁵

This all also entails that what we have to call Kant's "theory of thinking" ("account-giving," judging) has a component that is not something merely supplemental to the basic features of his general or content-less logic as rules for valid judgments and inferences. It is, rather, *the* basic feature: judging is apperceptive. This is a logical (or formal) truth, and because all judging is apperceptive, conscious of judging in judging, it is quite misleading for Kant to formulate the point by saying that the "I think" must "accompany" (*begleiten*) all my representations (B132).⁶ Representing objects is not representing objects, a claiming to be so, unless apperceptive (which is in effect what the B132 passage claims). And that has to mean, in a very peculiar sense that is important to Hegel and that will take some time to unpack, that such judgments are necessarily and inherently reflexive, and so at the very least are self-referential, even if such a reflected content is not substantive, does not refer to a subject's focusing on her judging activity as if it were a second consciousness.

Virtually everything in the *Logic* of significance descends in one way or another from the proper understanding of this claim. In an earlier book on Hegel,⁷ I tried to show this by orienting the entire interpretation of Hegel there presented from such passages in the *Logic* as

It is one of the profoundest and truest insights to be found in the *Critique of Reason* that the unity which constitutes the essence of the concept is recognized as the original synthetic unity of apperception, the unity of the "I think," or of self-consciousness. (12.17–18)

And especially, considering that Hegel means by the Concept the fully developed (self-developed) self-consciousness of pure thinking about itself, I argued in that book that it was of the utmost significance that he says such things as

5. Longuenesse 2007, 76. This is also stressed in a clear discussion by Wolff (2013).

6. "The I think must be able to accompany all my representations; for otherwise something would be represented in me that could not be thought at all, which is as much as to say that the representation would either be impossible or else at least would be nothing for me."

7. Pippin 1989.

I confine myself to one remark, which may contribute to the comprehension of the concept here developed and facilitate one's way into it. The concept, when it has progressed to a concrete existence which is itself free, is none other than the "I" or pure self-consciousness. (12.17)

And

This is an objectivity which the subject matter consequently attains in the concept, and this concept is the unity of self-consciousness into which that subject matter has been assumed; consequently its objectivity or the concept is itself none other than the nature of self-consciousness, has no other moments or determinations than the "I" itself. (12.19)⁸

Thinking's ability to determine the necessary, constitutive moments of thinking makes, for Hegel, Kant's strict distinction between general and transcendental logic impossible. And if it is impossible, then we have a form of genuine knowledge in view that undermines the requirement that the content of thinking must always be provided "from without," and so have in view thinking's reflective relation to itself as the source of what Hegel calls the "movement" or pulsation of the *Logic*. The *Logic* is not, that is, a survey of the structure of thinking but self-determined production. The moments are the products of thought's self-determination.

So when Kant distinguishes animals from humans in this respect, he notes that there is a difference between "distinguishing things" (something like differential responsiveness) and "cognizing the distinction of things" (knowing and holding in mind what is being distinguished). And from Kant's 1762 "Essay on the Mistaken Subtlety of the Four Figures": "The following distinction may be of great use: Logical distinction is the cognition that A is not B, and is always a negative judgment. To distinguish physically is to be impelled by different ideas to different actions."⁹ As Tiles puts it: "What distinguishes rational beings is their ability to make their own thoughts and

8. The present study attempts a response to many criticisms made of this interpretation, that it made Hegel "too Kantian," despite the fact that one has only to take Hegel at his word in these and the many other passages cited in the previous two chapters to appreciate Kant's enormous importance for Hegel. The idea was never that Hegel was a "Kantian," but that we cannot appreciate his profound differences with Kant unless we appreciate his enormous debt on this appreciation point.

9. Kant 1992, 95.

actions the object of their own thought.”¹⁰ This is in effect what happens whenever we *judge*, but if we want to get Kant’s innovation right, we have to be very clear that this has nothing to do with inner perception or the mind observing itself.¹¹

That is, to judge is to be aware not only of *what* one is judging, but that one is judging, asserting, claiming something. But one is not, cannot be, simultaneously judging that one is judging (something Tiles’s formulation, which is a common one, can easily suggest). Rather, judgment *is* the consciousness of judging. These are not two acts, but one. As Sebastian Rödl puts it: “The spontaneity of thought is of a special kind: it is a spontaneity whose acts are knowledge.”¹² Here again, it is extremely difficult to formulate this point properly. Rödl says: not two acts but one. I know what I believe, for example, know of my beliefs, by being the believer, by being identical with one who believes. But the grammar of the formulation says: acts of theoretical knowledge are *also*, besides being knowledge of some state of affairs, “knowledge of these very acts.” (Even the formulation “judgment *is*, is identical with, is the same thing as, the consciousness of judgment” introduces the language of consciousness and object into the apperceptive dimension in a way that is bound to be confusing. This is not yet to mention the reflective oddness of the phrase. If judgment is the consciousness of *judgment*, that of which it is conscious must *itself* be the consciousness of judgment.)¹³ So in

10. Tiles 2004, 97.

11. Kant distinguishes between an analytic unity of apperception and a synthetic unity. The former is the unity required when I “analyze out,” in a judgment about the melting point of copper, the concepts bearing on that predication, that copper is a metal, for example, and so its melting point can be compared with those of other metals. In so analyzing I must also be apperceptively aware of what I am doing in a way sensitive to what can be analytically related to what. What is of interest for the comparison with Hegel is the original synthetic unity of apperception, in which the understanding is not at work on what has been unified, analyzing out components, or abstracting to reach higher abstractions, but, to speak figuratively, achieving the basic forms of unity necessary for a thinking to be an intelligible thinking at all, which forms, Kant will argue, are the categories.

12. Rödl 2007, 14. And, “My knowing that *p* includes and is included in my knowing that I know it, which latter knowledge therefore is unmediated first person knowledge” (139); and “actions do not point to a state of mind as to their cause. Acting intentionally *is* being of a certain mind” (49). This latter is a Hegelian thought, albeit with implications other than those Rödl draws. See Pippin 2008, 147–79.

13. See Dieter Henrich’s pioneering work arguing that this logic can exclude the possibility of a naturalistic account of judgment, without positing anything supernatural, beginning with Henrich 1966. The argument has been extended and developed in many ways and by reference to the German romantics by Manfred Frank (2002; 2007).

knowing that the book is red, if I say that I know something about the book *and* something about my acts of knowledge, *why* are there not two acts? I cannot be a believer unless I know that I am believing, and I know that *by being the believer*. But, besides what I believe, what exactly do I know by being the believer? The formulation “knowledge of my acts” of belief would have to mean I also know that I have knowledge of my acts, and we would be off to the regresses. There must be some way of saying that the self-conscious dimension of thought and action is a matter of the way a claim is made or an action undertaken. To adopt the formulations used by Ryle in accounting for many similar phenomena, they are accomplished “self-consciously,” rather than accompanied by or even identical with another act of consciousness.¹⁴

Since Hegel treats thought’s self-consciousness of itself in thinking in terms of the Concept—that is, as argued in *Hegel’s Idealism*, the Concept just is thought’s self-consciousness of itself in thinking—we can put his point in a somewhat more familiar way as well.

Animals, for example (this point always seems to inspire response couched in terms of animals), can have very sophisticated differential responsivenesses to their environment, and clearly can be said to be able to make higher-order conceptual discrimination (same species/other species, food/not food, etc.), but, to speak a bit of McDowellese, not *as such*. It is a condition of use of a concept that the use is subject to a norm of correct and incorrect use, and that norm is internal to the concept. Or, in using a concept (and not just differentially responding), I must know I am discriminating in a way that may be wrong, and I know this *in the use*, not as a second-order reflection.

Now in perception (as opposed to judgments based on perception) the issue is different, but if the animal is a rational perceiver, we should say that the deployment of concepts in perceptual discrimination must be such that they are available for judgment or self-conscious use. Such capacities as judgment and self-consciousness are called into play in a way that can be redeemed if challenged, for example. (This too is different for nonrational

14. See Ryle 1979: “To *X*, thinking what one is doing, is not to be doing both some *X*-ing and some separately do-able *Y*-ing; it is to be *X*-ing under a variety of qualifications, such as *X*-ing on purpose, with some tentativeness, some vigilance against some known hazards, some perseverance and with at least a modicum of intended or unintended self-training. It is to *X* intentionally, experimentally, circumspectly and practisingly, and these by themselves are not additional things that he is doing or might be doing” (24).

animals.) This is, must be, already implicit in their being called into play in perceiving at all, and is not a subfaculty to which rationality is added on.

There is a self-referential component in any judgment or action too (“I think this, I act thus”), but it can be misleading to think that this is the same problem as “how does the first-person pronoun have sense, and thereby pick me uniquely out.” As we shall see, it is misleading because it suggests a punctuated moment of awareness, something that has a different temporal dimension, one connected to the open-ended character of rationality in believing and acting.

At the most general level, being a concrete subject is nothing over and above a consciousness of such concreteness, not a second-order awareness of concrete properties; at least this is so if we have the proper conception of subjectivity in mind. To be a Christian is to take oneself to be one. A necessary condition of being a professor is that one take oneself to be one. *Being* a professor *is* that consciousness, once the appropriate social role and its conditions exist. Being the agent of that deed is the consciousness of agency in the doing.¹⁵ So, for example:

The most important point for the nature of spirit is the relation, not only of what it implicitly is in itself to what it actually is, but of what it knows itself to be to what it actually is; because spirit is essentially consciousness, this self-knowledge is a fundamental determination of its actuality. (21.16)

Finally, there is little doubt that Hegel realized that apperception was not a kind of consciousness. In discussing Fichte, he says,

If other Kantians have expanded on the determining of the intended object by the “I” by saying that the objectifying of the “I” is to be regarded as an original and necessary deed of consciousness [*Thun des Bewußtseins*], so that in this original deed there is not yet the representation of the “I”—which would be only a consciousness of that consciousness, or itself an objectifying of that consciousness—then this objectifying deed, liberated from the opposition of consciousness, is closer to what may be taken simply as thinking as such. But this deed should no longer be called consciousness; for consciousness holds within itself the opposition of the

15. See also Pippin 2008, chap. 7.

“I” and its intended object *which is not to be found in that original deed*. The name “consciousness” gives it more of a semblance of subjectivity than does the term “thought,” which here, however, is to be taken in the absolute sense of infinite thought, not as encumbered by the finitude of consciousness; in short, thought as such. (SL 21.47–48)

Thought’s Self-Constitution

I understand the adverbial qualification to be suggested by Rödl’s discussion of what he calls an unmediated way of knowing, “from the inside,” not of some “other” or by any inner perception (in the spirit of the passage just quoted). Knowing from the inside (by being the knower) is

A way of knowing such that my first person reference is constituted by a relation I bear to the object—identity—by which I know it in this way.¹⁶

Or more precisely, “when I know an object in a first person way, I know it by being that object.”¹⁷

This question (“what exactly do I know besides what I believe by being the believer”) is *the same question as*: how can the self-relation inherent in all cognitive relation to the world, and in all action, which self-relation certainly *has* the form of a dyadic relation, *not* be a dyadic relation, but be the expression of an *identity*? Since self-consciousness is the structural feature of knowledge and action, everything depends on the right formulation and drawing the right implications. I know what I am doing not by identifying myself with the one acting, but by being the one acting. So how can such a Two also be One? We are in the middle of everything of significance in Hegel’s *Logic*, not to mention Fichte’s *Wissenschaftslehre* and Schelling’s early idealism. We are at the heart of the problem they called *Identitätstheorie*. (For example, in Fichte’s early versions of the *Wissenschaftslehre*, the possibility of the I’s or ego’s identification of itself in all its experiences mirrors the “division” at the heart of any statement of identity, a division that is also somehow not a division, as in the difference between “A is A,” and simply “A.” In fact, he argues, the very intelligibility of any statement of the law of identity presupposes the I’s self-identity and self-differentiation. A cannot be identified as A

16. Rödl 2007, 10.

17. Rödl 2007, 98.

unless the “I” of the “first” A is the same as the “I” of the second A and knows it is. And since identity is the first principle of any possible intelligibility, the issue is, in the systematic sense, primordial.)¹⁸

This too is important to state carefully. Hegel scholars often assume that Hegel inherits “identity philosophy” from Schelling, and that it means “the identity of subject and object.” They then formulate various philosophically implausible versions of such an identity, such as that true reality is divine thought thinking itself, that objects are moments of this thought’s “intellectual intuition of itself.” But the *Logic* is not committed to anything remotely like this. As we shall see in more detail in a moment, in thinking of identity, Hegel is first of all thinking of self-consciousness in any consciousness, where the subject of knowledge is identical with itself, where there is no difference between the subject and the object of its knowledge; all of this as Rödl formulates it in his own terms. And Rödl is expressing a Hegelian thought when he says that this is not just a feature of an isolated problematic, a theory of self-consciousness. This unusual identity is constitutive of “theoretical thought” as such. Theoretical thought, he says, “is a reality that includes its subject’s knowledge of it.”¹⁹ So a subject’s knowledge “that and why she believes what she does, which she expresses in giving the explanation, is not a separate existence from what it represents. It includes and is included in the reality of which it is knowledge.”²⁰

This has an important implication. The theoretical thought of any content cannot be understood as the momentary or punctuated grasp of a solitary item. The thought of the content is also, is identical with, the thought of whatever reasons there are to delimit a concept in such a way and not some other, for example, the thought of discreteness in its contrast with continuity, or the thought of essence in its contrast with appearances. We are not thinking of discreteness if we cannot think of what such a notion excludes, presupposes, requires, if we have no idea how such discrete magnitudes could form a continuum. These are, for Hegel, reasons that differentiate it from its contrary, reasons that allow success in distinguishing the content from its complements or contraries. That the thought of the content is also the thought of my thinking it has this implication, is what that apperceptive element amounts to.

18. And this formulation about the centrality of the logic of self-consciousness problem formulates Hegel’s project in the most appropriate way, far from the problem of knowing something about a self-transforming, infinite abstract object.

19. Rödl 2007, 101.

20. Rödl 2007, 101.

But now we can try to explain something that can sound very extreme which Rödl alludes to but does not develop. In a swipe at empiricism, he notes that thought has the power to *be the principle of the existence of its objects*. He does not say one object, thought itself, but all its proper objects. To some this will sound like Fichte, that the *Ich*, in positing itself, posits the *nicht-Ich*. That is absolutely right, but not in the sense in which it is usually understood. Consider this passage from the second introduction to the 1796/1799 *Wissenschaftslehre (nova methodo)*, translated as *Foundations of Transcendental Philosophy*. The passage I am interested in follows a general claim that “The idealist observes that experience in its entirety is nothing but an acting on the part of a rational being.” There then follows a gloss on “the viewpoint of idealism.”

The idealist observes how there must come to be things for the individual. Thus the situation is different for the [observed] individual than it is for the philosopher. The individual is confronted with things, men, etc., that are independent of him. But the idealist says, ‘There are no things outside me and present independently of me.’ Though the two say opposite things, they do not contradict each other. For the idealist, from his own viewpoint, displays the necessity of the individual’s view. When the idealist says, ‘outside of me,’ he means ‘outside of reason’; when the individual says the same thing, he means ‘outside of my person.’

Or, in an even more summary claim from Fichte’s notes: “the I is reason.”
So to bring all this together:

Judgment is the consciousness of judgment.

But one is “conscious of judging” in an unusual way, by *being* the judger.

Being the judger, believer, or thinker of anything is as if in answer to the question “what ought to be judged, believed, or thought in that way?”

This means, at the highest abstraction, that the thought (belief, assertion) of some content (like finitude or causality) is at the same time the thought of the reasons that are required for such an “answer.”

If the thought of *objects* (as a successful thought) is identical in this way with the thought of what is presupposed and required for such a determination, then there is a way of stating the identity of subject and object, or the *Ich*’s determination of the *nicht-Ich* in its positing of itself, that is captured in the quotation from Fichte just given.

The determination of the object as that object or that kind of object is at

the same time the determination of the reasons (the subject's reasons) to so determine it.

Finally, thought can also investigate what is generally presupposed, what is required, in order to judge anything, to think determinately any content. It does not learn these from experience, does not apprehend them as ideal objects.

It has to be said to give them to itself.

The record of some such attempts is *The Science of Logic*.

Since these metaconcepts are the forms of whatever can be truly said, and what is truly said is what is the case, they are the forms of reality.

Herein lies another lesson, though, in the difficulty of finding the right formulation. In his chapter 3, Rödl, in discussing the main features of this order, i.e., inferential relations (believing q because I believe p and p implies q), argues that such inferences themselves reveal that there must be a reason it is right to believe something *other than* because of an inference from something else one believes. This different way “will reveal the order under which I bring myself in asking what to believe.”²¹ He recalls his previous chapter on action, where he showed that a chain of practical instrumental reasoning terminates “in a finite end that no longer falls under the normative order under which the conclusion is brought, but is that order.”²² Likewise, he says now, in theoretical knowledge, “a chain of inferences must terminate in beliefs that no longer conform to, but are the order to which beliefs inferred from them conform.”²³ Later he will say that “the order of inference is not self-standing.”²⁴ Rather, “inference is governed by an order to which one conforms in acts of believing that something is the case that manifests a power of knowledge.”²⁵ (This is a difficult sentence. The last clause could modify “order” or “acts of believing.” The ambiguity does not affect the point I want to make in the following paragraph.)

It cannot be the case that this moment that defines the rightness of the whole order of inferences is itself the content of a separate belief or representation. We would be heading straight for Lewis Carroll's paradoxes of Achilles and the tortoise. It must be that *what it is* to determine what it is right to believe because of what else one believes is *itself*, just thereby, “to

21. Rödl 2007, 70.

22. Rödl 2007, 70.

23. Rödl 2007, 71.

24. Rödl 2007, 88.

25. Rödl 2007, 88.

reveal the order under which I bring myself in asking what to believe.” And this in the same difficult-to-state way that judgment is the consciousness of judgment. And in just the same way that, being committed to the truth of a proposition, I am just thereby committed to the denial of everything inconsistent with it. The latter is not a separate inference I draw, on the basis of my first commitment. It is a dimension of the content of my first commitment. This is not to say I must be conscious of these implications and incompatibilities, but just that I could not be thinking that content were I not able to be responsive to such considerations. This is all so just as someone’s believing something and her thought that it is something right to believe “*are the same reality*.”²⁶ (I understand Rödl to make something like this point himself, in an objection to Christine Korsgaard.)²⁷

Reflection on these features of judging or believing or doing brings us back to our starting point.²⁸ Their all being undertaken self-consciously means no one could be said to “just” assert, or just believe, or just act. Any such undertaking, if self-conscious, must be potentially responsive to the question of “Why?”; that is, to reasons. (An assertion *is* such a responsiveness; the latter is not a secondary or even distinct dimension of the former.) And it is at least plausible to say that the greater the extent of such potential responsiveness (or said another way, the greater the self-understanding), the “freer” the activity, the more I can be said to redeem the action as genuinely mine, back it, stand behind it.

The Concept as Self-Consciousness

Kant was well aware that with this notion of apperceptive judging he was breaking with the rationalist (and Lockean) notion of reflection as inner perception, and as we shall see, Hegel’s language is everywhere carefully Kantian in this respect.²⁹ Since self-consciousness is the *form* of all possible knowledge and action, a great deal will hang on what we should call the appropriate

26. Rödl 2007, 92. Or see 96. The thought “‘I believe that *p* because _____’ and the thought ‘It is right to believe *p* because _____’ stand in a relation such that the former represents the latter, the theoretical reasoning. But these are not two thoughts.” And, “Her thinking the thought that represents the causality is her thinking the thought that is the causality.” Or the “causality of the [belief] explanation contains the subject’s representation of this very causality” (97).

27. Rödl 2007, 92–93.

28. Believing is more complicated, because there can be several things I believe that I don’t know I believe. But in determining what you believe, you are not searching in an inner mental inventory; you are determining what you take to be true, what you could apperceptively affirm.

29. See again the passage at 21.47–48, quoted earlier.

“logic” of this self-relation, where we mean not what we intend when we turn our attention to ourselves, but in what relation to ourselves we are when we claim something or act.

The claim common to Kant and Hegel is that judging is apperceptive, and that this is a logical matter, a matter of the very concept of judging, and this because no act of judging, asserting to be the case, say, could be such an act if the subjective judging were not self-consciously judging. A stand cannot be taken on how things are as a matter of some propositional structure, or some logical relation as such. Someone must *take* such a stand, and they cannot do so without knowing that they are doing so. A propositional structure, considered on its own, represents nothing, claims nothing. Again, it is not at all easy to say what “self-consciously judging” amounts to,³⁰ if the self-relation is not a two-place relation, as it is not. That is, to reiterate, the claim does not mean that some judge must be attending to her asserting then and there. That would be a reflective attending that would require its own account, and I could be said to be undertaking such an attending only if I did *that* self-consciously, knew what I was about. But what I am thinking or doing could not *be* asserting or doing if, for example, I could be surprised on being informed that I had in fact been asserting, or if I discovered it myself. For one thing, one can’t be asserting something without being available to the question: why are you asserting that? If in some unusual context, you were able to say, “I didn’t know I was asserting anything,” then you were not asserting anything (subject to the obvious qualifications about self-deception). And the qualification that thinking must be self-consciously thinking *to be* such a thinking means that the same unusual self-relation must hold for actions, doings. I can’t be writing a book on Hegel unless I am self-consciously writing—not writing and also attending to my act of writing. It wouldn’t be an act of writing except if done self-consciously, and even explicitly attending to my act of writing must itself be a self-conscious attending.³¹

There is an obvious corollary to this feature of judging or believing or doing. As noted, their all being undertaken self-consciously means no one could be said to “just” assert, or just believe, or just act. Any such undertaking, if self-conscious, must be potentially responsive to the question of “Why?”; that is, to reasons. And it is at least plausible to say that the greater the extent of such potential responsiveness (or said another way, the greater

30. See Pippin (1982, 172ff.), on the difference between apperception and inner sense.

31. See the useful phrase in Koch 2014: “Die Subjektivität ist wissende Selbstbeziehung ohne expliziten Selbstbezug; ein inferentielles, kein referentielles Selbstverhältnis” (145).

the self-understanding), the “freer” the activity, the more I can be said to redeem the action as genuinely mine, back it, stand behind it. We thus have formulated what Rödl rightly identifies as the heart of German Idealism, the principle “that self-consciousness, freedom and reason are one.”³²

As cited in the preceding chapter, Hegel said that the subject matter of the *Logic* is thinking (*Denken*), understood as an activity (*Tätigkeit*), which means that thinking is the “active universal” (*das tätige Allgemeine*) or the “self-activating” (*sich betätigende*) universal, because the deed (*Tat*) or that brought about (*Hervorgebrachte*) is the universal (*das Allgemeine*). At the beginning of the logic of the Concept, Hegel glosses this activity in a way that also expresses a Kantian thought. That is, he rejects the idea of the judgment as the combination of independent concepts, subjects, and predicates, and insists instead that the relation between the determinacy of concepts and their roles in judgments is in effect one of identity; their determinacy is their role in judging. He has his own way of putting this, but I think the point is clear. He is trying to explain here what he means by saying that “the concept as such does not abide within itself [*prozeßlos in sich verharrend*] without development,” calling the concept instead “totally active,” in that it is always “distinguishing itself from itself.”

This sundering [*Diremption*] of the Concept into the distinction of its moments that is posited by its own activity is *the judgment*, the significance of which must accordingly be conveyed as the particularization [*Besonderung*] of the Concept. (EL §166Z, my emphasis)³³

In Kant as well as in Hegel concepts are predicates of possible judgments, even the concepts or the categories, dependence on which is necessary for any empirical conceptual determination to be possible.³⁴ This means that concepts cannot be independently “grasped” as determinate entities. Think-

32. Rödl 2007, 105.

33. His own paraphrase of this claim will require some preparation to understand properly. “If we advance from this to the judging of the object, the judgment is not our subjective doing, by which this or that predicate is ascribed to the object; on the contrary, we are considering the object in the determinacy that is posited by the concept.” EL §166Z.

34. As in Kant’s first *Critique*:

Concepts are predicates of possible judgments [*Prädikate möglicher Urteile*], are related to some representation of a still undetermined object. The concept of body thus signifies something, e.g. metal, which can be cognized [*erkannt*] only through that concept. It is therefore a concept only because other representations are contained under it by means of which it can be related to objects. (A69/B94; see also B146)

ing that they could be produces what Hegel is forever calling “dead,” lifeless, static, “untrue” concepts. (This truth is part of what we are learning in the *Seinslogik*: learning that it is not possible to understand conceptual determinacy this way, all by assuming it is, and failing.) And this means that the logic of being can be deeply misleading, as if we *are* simply entertaining concepts as such, one by one.³⁵ In trying to understand this claim, we can recall here the passage where Hegel claimed that the Gestalt, the form, of concepts was the *form of the self*, that in science, the truth is self-consciousness.

Concepts have the form of a self in this sense, that they are moments of apperceptive predication, self-conscious judging, just as the self is what it takes itself to be, just as I know what I am doing by being the doer. They are what they are taken to be, determined to be, in the interconnected practices of conceptual determination. This alone will be the source of the claim for “logical movement.” In the greater *Logic*, and through such logical movement, determinate judgment is said to be the “determining of the Concept through itself,” and is said to be “the realization [*Realisierung*] of the Concept, for reality [*Realität*] denotes in general the entry into existence as determinate being” (12.53). Or: concepts are determinate only by virtue of their roles in judgment, the “bringing to the objective unity of apperception,” in Kant’s definition.

So a concept like “essence,” for example, can be said to be delimitable as just that concept by virtue of its possible uses in various contrasts with “appearance” or by virtue of its negation (in the grand structure of the *SL*) of the concept “being,” or its role in distinguishing accidental from essential predicates. These are all roles in judgments (and are thereby tied to judgmental roles in inferences). Any of these uses, though, involves any such claim in a network of justifications, a normative order. The application of any such concept in judgment, since apperceptive, self-consciously applied, must be, just thereby, responsive to its possible misapplication, and the question of the general contours of its correct use implicates any one notion in the normative proprieties governing many others. Hence, as we shall see, the course of the “movement” of the *Logic*.

Brandom has pointed out just what a radical alteration this all is from the Cartesian or representational model of intelligibility as such. Descartes had a much more abstract (eventually symbolic) conception of representation

35. So the idea that one sometimes hears, that if we can figure out the “dialectical method” at the beginning, in the first transitions, we will have a fix on the “method” and understand it later in the work, is misguided. Nothing could be further from the Hegelian truth. Cf. Henrich’s (1971, 81) clear statement of the problems we get into when we take such an approach.

than the empiricists, but he had to hold that since we know what we know representationally, we cannot know our own representations that way without a regress. We must know them immediately, just by having them, or in his terms certainly. Whereas:

Kant has a new model of intelligibility: to be intelligible is to have a content articulated by *concepts*. It is the concepts applied in an act of awareness (apperception) that determine what would count as successfully integrating that judgment into a whole exhibiting the distinctive synthetic unity of apperception.³⁶

And this is what Brandom means by apperception.

Awareness is apperception. The minimal unit of apperception is judgment. To judge is to integrate a conceptually articulated content into a constellation of commitments exhibiting the distinctive synthetic unity of apperception. Doing that is extruding from the constellation commitments incompatible with the judgment being made and extracting from

36. Brandom 2011, 7; 2014, 10. I note a disagreement with Brandom. Like Rorty, he associates Kant with Descartes in distinguishing our relation to our representings (in Kant, now, judgments) and representeds. ("So Kant shares with Descartes the two-stage representational structure.") That relation is not immediate, as it is in Descartes, known just by being had, not by being represented, but it is apperceptive. Brandom takes this to mean that any judger is taking on the burden of integrating any such judgment with consistency into the system of judgments itself. This is what generates skepticism about the thing in itself. We can't say why our systematic integration of representings should have anything to do with the representeds in themselves. But this ascribes to Kant a dyadic relation between the subject and its judgments. The subject must manipulate the judgment into systematic consistency. This might be an *overall* rationality requirement, but it is not what apperception originally means in Kant. There is no dyadic relation between me and my representings *in* apperception. Representing in the Kantian sense (judging) is consciousness of judging, and so necessarily has a subjective "value," as Kant calls it, with respect to *the subject* (problematic, assertoric, or apodictic). When the judgment is true (in knowledge), the content of the judgment is what is the case. The language of representation and relation to representing confuses all of this and suggests that Kant thinks we are stuck with relations to representings, be the representeds as they may. Hegel, I want to suggest, realized Kant's break with Descartes and the massive importance of an apperceptive instead of a representational model, but thought Kant was not true to his own best insights. Kant made the same mistake about his own position as Brandom does. I don't think this is true of the "real" Kant, but that is neither here nor there with respect to the most important point about the error of the Cartesian model. Said another way, the way to avoid the central flaw, which Brandom also attributes to Frege, "treating representings as intelligible in a sense in which representeds are in general not," is to appreciate the implications of the apperceptive character of representings (judgings).

it inferential consequences that are then added to that constellation of commitments. This is a process that is mediated by the relations of material incompatibility and consequence that relate the concepts being applied in the judgment to the concepts applied in other possible judgments.³⁷

This seems to me *ultimately* an implication of the apperceptive character of judgment, but as formulated it seems to involve some reflection on what *else* I am committed to if I am committed to *p*, a “further” realization. The impression is of a moment like: “Well, I assert *p*. Now what have I gotten myself into?” It somewhat deemphasizes the fact that Kant and Hegel want to insist on an unusual self-relation in relation to any articulated content (see the section below), and at some basic level (the level Brandom calls the “meta-conceptual framework of reason” in Hegel), and only at that level, this relation is inherently *self*-negating, and so not just a matter of extruding incompatibilities whenever, if ever, they arise. Brandom’s account is a general account of the nature of conceptual content in empirical, in mathematical, in theoretical concepts, and it is surely Hegelian in its inspiration. But, as he freely concedes, it does not (yet) distinguish the unique claims of the concepts treated in the *Logic*.

I put it this way (“yet”) because Brandom is well aware of the differences between “ground level” concepts and “higher level speculative concepts” and thus far wants to point out only that any understanding of the latter requires “applying the lessons” learned at the former level and has not yet suggested how that application goes. He does say, in his Munich lectures,

What he calls “speculative,” or “logical” concepts are theoretical philosophical metaconcepts whose distinctive expressive role it is to make explicit features of the conceptual contents and use (the semantics and pragmatics) of those ground-level concepts.³⁸

In fact, he claims that the importance of this distinction has been unappreciated.

I think this aspect of Hegel’s thought has not been much remarked upon because of a failure to keep two sets of books: one on his views of determi-

37. Brandom 2011, I, 6.

38. Brandom 2011, III, 19.

nate empirical and practical concepts, the other on the *logical*, speculative, philosophical metaconcepts whose distinctive expressive job it is to make explicit what is going on when we apply the ground-level concepts.³⁹

But in his formulations we are at two removes from the *Logic*'s treatment of these speculative concepts.

In these lectures I have focused on what Hegel will have to say about the semantics and pragmatics of the concepts deployed and determined through base-level experience, by way of preparation for understanding the course of the experience of meta-level *self*-consciousness that he recollects for us in the body of the *Phenomenology*.

This promises to get us from an explanation of the conceptual content of and the role in veridical experience of bent sticks and red squares and the like, to "the thing and its properties," or "force" or "reason" or "Geist," but these are linked to Geist's experience of itself in its engagement with the world and with others. And, as Brandom lucidly explains, experience involves a distinction between "for consciousness" and "in itself." That distinction is not relevant to the treatment of the very possibility of intelligibility in the *Logic*. Accordingly, it is not clear what the bearing of this investigation of the *Phenomenology* has on concepts like finitude, continuity, essence, ground, and the like, which are not, in any even metaconceptual sense, experiential, and are not treated by Hegel as retrospective comments on empirical discovery and meaning change. It is not that there is just another step to be taken. The question is whether Brandom has given us the resources to take that step. I discuss this issue in more depth in the next chapter.

Logical Infinity: Kantian Origins

Moreover, a proper understanding of the self's relation to itself in thinking, the form of any conceiving and thereby any concept, and thereby any inferential relation, is also the core meaning of what Hegel calls the "infinity" treated by speculative philosophy (EL §28A),⁴⁰ in contradistinction to (tra-

39. Brandom 2012, 19.

40. The idea, which will recur frequently, that thought, in its relation to itself in any relation to an object, is not limited by its object, itself, does not mean that subjects ultimately just decide what to affirm. In this sense, it means that thought as such can be delimited (can assert this, and not that) only by thought, not by nonthought. This is an essentially Fichtean thought.

ditional) metaphysics, the domain of *Verstand* and finitude (EL §27). Later in the EL, Hegel states Kant's point in his own speculative language.

What is here called object of reason, the unconditioned, is nothing but the self-equivalent [*das Sich-selbst-Gleiche*]; in other words, it is the original identity of the I in thinking. (§45)

This is yet again not an easy thought: some sort of self-relation that is not a two-place relation, but something like a circular structure, in which the self's self-relation never terminates in a distinct object or determinate posit, but in so attending, returns to itself as relating. (The relation is to a "self" that is the original subject of the relation: a relation, or a difference, even with such an identity, to insert Hegel's frequent way of framing the issue.) This is "infinity" in the proper sense, Hegel tells us frequently,⁴¹ and, as he says in his discussion of "Being-for-self," "Self-consciousness is thus the nearest example of the presence of infinity." (SL 21.145).⁴²

With this topic of "infinity," we are at the very limits now of being able to follow Hegel, at least at my limits. It would be reasonable to say that, formulated this way, the structure of this nondyadic self-relation (that is nevertheless a relation) is impossible to understand in any systematic way (and by hypothesis that would mean understanding the possibility of intelligible knowing and acting), and the impossibility represents the failure of German Idealism. This is Dieter Henrich's claim.⁴³ We could conclude from this, either that we have made a wrong turn somewhere and must begin anew, or that the issue itself—or the complex of issues, self-relation in relation to the world, self-knowledge, the sense of the first-person pronoun, personal

41. See Horstmann's (2006, 69–84) discussion of this claim. Horstmann demonstrates that Hegel means by infinity "self-related subjectivity" in this sense, but without more detail about what makes such "subjectivity" *subjective*, there is a danger of reifying the SL's object, as if it were some self-moving categorical structure in itself, or "the logical process" (83). One can avoid attributing to Hegel a so-called subjectivistic, impositionist, noumenally ignorant idealism, without such a mystified "objectivism." For that matter, that characterization is unfair to Kant as well.

42. This is of course not the only concept of the infinite that Hegel treats in the SL. In the section on quantity, for example, he discusses the mathematical infinite as it appears in the differential and integral calculus, and he engages in a critique of the notion of the "infinitesimal." (His general claim is that the ordinary notion of the infinite is "contradictory" because it treats the infinite as finite, as the concept of what totality one would reach by conceiving of some endless series as a whole. The infinite is treated as a thing and not as the *principle* of the extension, as a function.) For the best discussion of Hegel's treatment of the mathematically infinite, see Pinkard (1988, 45–54).

43. Henrich 1982, 131, 174.

identity—does not allow a systematic but only an “approximate” articulation. (The latter is also Henrich’s position.) Or we could hope that the problem in formulating this structure stems from the limitations inherent in a kind of formulation, say a *Verstand* formulation, and that a different conception of the “logic of thought, of intelligibility,” might be possible. This is, of course, Hegel’s position in *The Science of Logic*.

This framework issue prepares us for the even bolder passage that we have seen already.

It is one of the profoundest and truest insights to be found in the *Critique of Reason* that the unity which constitutes the essence of the concept is recognized as the original synthetic unity of apperception, the unity of the “I think,” or of self-consciousness.—This proposition is all that there is to the so-called transcendental deduction of the categories which, from the beginning, has however been regarded as the most difficult piece of Kantian philosophy. (*SL* 12.18)⁴⁴

When one considers that Hegel just before this passage characterized his own non plus ultra, the concept, “when it has progressed to a concrete existence which is itself free,” as “none other than the ‘I’ or pure self-consciousness” (12.17),⁴⁵ then it is clear that such claims promise a very great deal: not only a potential basis for an interpretation of what Hegel means by “der Begriff” in general, but also what he meant by another claim distinctive of his speculative philosophy that has bedeviled commentators for generations, that the concept *gives itself* its own actuality. For Hegel’s second sentence claims that once we understand that the unity which constitutes the essence of the concept is none other than the original synthetic unity of apperception, we will just *thereby* have already accomplished the task of the forbidding transcen-

44. This is not to say Hegel did not have problems with the “abstract universality” of Kant’s notion of apperception. See *EL* §20; *SL* 12.194.

45. As we shall see in chapter 9, this will mean that when Hegel is considering the unique status of the subject matter of the logic of the Concept—that is, while the thought-determinations of the first two logics were attempts at the determination of the Absolute, the logic of the Concept will be about what it is to determine the Absolute, and so a form of absolute reflexivity—we need at the very least to take our bearings from his understanding of Kant’s view of the role of apperception as constitutive of judgment itself. That is, the conceptual/judgmental forms relevant to these first two logics are themselves self-determining, implicitly the concept of themselves, all brought to explicitness in the logic of the Concept.

dental deduction, will have established the objective validity of the categories, or, in Hegelian terms, their actuality.

Interestingly, this already was something hinted at once by Kant, given that both Kant and Hegel understood concepts as predicates of possible judgments, and that for both judgment is the basic unit of self-conscious intelligibility. Hence Kant's intimation of a one-step deduction when he claimed that the argument of the Deduction can be solved with

just as much ease, since it can almost be accomplished through a single inference from the precisely determined definition of a judgment in general (an action through which given representations first become cognitions of an object).⁴⁶

Roughly, the thought behind such remarks is this. What Kant called the original synthetic unity of apperception is what Hegel calls "the essence of the unity of the concept." This could be understood initially in a formal sense. Both unities are classic cases of "one-over-many." Even an empirical concept, like red, remains identifiable as the same red, the same color, in all the many and various instances and shades in which it appears. Analogously, the manifold of experiences counts as a unity in all being ascribable to one I, that identical, selfsame I who has all such experiences. But both Hegel and Kant do not want to merely point out a structural analogy. The unity of apperception is the unity of a concept. That is, as Kant makes clear, to say that experience is always subject to the original synthetic unity of apperception is to say that it is always subject to the understanding, the power of conceiving. So this is the power to hold things together as one, necessary for experience to have a unity ascribable to an identical I. Discriminating what belongs together with what, what is connected to what in a temporal order, knowing that the successive perceptions of a house do not count as the perception of a succession in the world, requires an apperceptive unity; it does not just happen to consciousness. What happens is mere succession. Such a unity is possible only self-consciously, and it is the actualization of the power of conceiving. But the unity effected by the power of conceiving (where "conceiving" means more than merely thinking or associating together) is the representational unity that makes reference to an object possible. Unifying by "red" achieves the unity that says how things are. The rose belongs with the red things, not

46. Kant 2004, 11.

with what has seemed red-like to me before. Without this ability to distinguish how things are from how they seem to me, there would be as many “I’s” as associated seemings, and no unity of self-consciousness.⁴⁷ Or, achieving the unity of self-consciousness *is* differentiating seeming from being, and so the rules for that distinction — categories — are constitutive of such unity. In other words, the “conditions of the possibility of experience are at the same time the conditions of the possibility of objects of experience.” Kant proposed an argument to show that any unity that could be said to be a product of affection alone, like an associative unity, presupposed what he called “a transcendental affinity,” that is, a power to distinguish a mere succession of representations from a representation of objective succession. Without that power, there could be no “one over many,” no manifold belonging to one I, one experienter. Hegel does not rely on the subjective form of inner sense like this and argues, as above, that if we understand correctly that the unity of any concept is the unity of apperception, and that such a unity is what establishes a possible relation to an object, then the categories, as the moments of any such possible unifying power, will thereby be shown to be actual, to make possible representation of objects. Or, a rigorous Metaphysical Deduction, properly conceived, is the only deduction we need.⁴⁸

Moreover, we need to take our bearings from Kant on the issue of what logic is and what relation it has to metaphysics, and how apperception fits in, *because Hegel does*, often, and he tells us why he does. In the very first sentence of the first preface of the greater *Logic*, Hegel unequivocally aligns himself with what he calls

47. Henrich (1982) has suggested two other ways in which objectivity, the possibility of true subject-predicate predication, depends on self-consciousness. Such predication is the ascription of a general term to a particular. But the successful identification of the particular requires the use of indexicals, which in turn require the mastery of the first-person pronoun and all that entails. Any subject that can refer must also have identified itself (135). And, in a way close to that described here, the intelligibility of any proposition presupposes the possibility of propositional assertion (*Satzbehauptung*), which requires differentiating *how it seems to me* from how it is. Necessarily, anyone capable of such a distinction is self-aware (136).

48. As we shall see in looking at the logic of essence, this could be put by saying that the categorical structure of the transcendental unity of apperception is the “essence” of empirical experience (or the transcendental ego is the essence of the empirical ego), with the empirical experience of ego as that essence’s manifestation or appearance, or initially mere seeming (*Schein*). As in all the essence-appearance relations considered in that logic, the problem will then be understanding how to connect the two, or as the argument develops, how to “ground” the latter in the former. This is, basically, anyway, the way Fichte would come to think of the issue, and its influence on Hegel is clear at the beginning of the logic of essence.

the complete transformation that the ways of philosophical thought have undergone among us in the past twenty-five odd years, the higher standpoint in self-awareness that spirit has attained in this period of time (21.5)

and he complains only that this unmistakably Kantian “complete transformation” (*völlige Umänderung*) has not yet had the proper influence on “logic.” (In effect he will raise a Kantian objection to Kant, that he was not critical enough about his logical assumptions.)⁴⁹ Likewise in the section The General Division of Logic, he stakes his claim as a post-Kantian with equal vigor and accuses post-Kantian philosophy of having fallen beneath the level of speculative truth attained by Kant.

I should point out that in this work I make frequent references to the Kantian philosophy (which to many might seem superfluous) because, whatever might be said here or elsewhere of its distinctive character or of particular parts of its exposition, it constitutes the foundation and the starting point of the new German philosophy, and this is a merit of which it can boast undiminished by whatever fault may be found in it. (21.46)

I think it is in this spirit that he tells us in that EL §24 we examined in the previous chapter that “logic coincides with metaphysics, with the science of things grasped in thoughts.”⁵⁰

Metaphysics, after the “complete transformation” effected by Kant, is not the science of things, but the “science of things grasped in thoughts,” and it is to be distinguished from what *used to be taken to be the case* (before

49. This affirmation of the need for critical self-reflection is not inconsistent with Hegel’s famous swipe at the way Kant went about the critical project. That criticism concerns the idea that such a critique must be prior to attempts to know, that we must establish first whether and to what extent knowledge is possible. That is what prompted Hegel’s barb that this would be like trying to learn to swim before going into the water. In typical fashion, Hegel affirms the need for critique, but its “position” is “after” and a reflection on the logical enterprise, that is, in the third book of the *Logic*.

50. See again 21.35. This transformation, however, was not complete, as Hegel constantly reminds us, because of an overly psychological or subjectivistic conception of thinking.

What Hegel is saying here and repeating many times elsewhere is brought out well in Bowman’s (2013) account. Kant brought “pre-critical metaphysics to an end” (64). He and Jacobi both realized that categoriality as they understood it was inadequate for a knowledge of the unconditioned. But instead of using this occasion to rethink their account of categoriality, they concluded we had no knowledge of things in themselves. Both Bowman and Wolff bring out the importance of Jacobi in these disputes.

the Great Kantian Transformation)—that these thoughts were the essentialities of things, were themselves thing-like. Now this sounds confusing because we have just seen that Hegel talks this way himself, about *Wesenheiten*, so in the addition to EL §24 he proceeds immediately to clear this up. He insists that his position does not hold that *what things really are* are thoughts or thinkings, or that nature is somehow “petrified thought,” as Schelling held. There is no question that Hegel sides with Kant’s destruction of scholastic and rationalist metaphysics—rational psychology, cosmology, and theology—because he tells us exactly that, and that he agrees wholeheartedly with Kant that ontology is “now” possible only as “logic.”⁵¹ (In EL §47, Hegel goes further and expresses great gratitude to Kant for destroying the possibility that “philosophizing about spirit” should have anything to do with “soul things.” He goes on to say that the very question of whether the soul is simple or alterable is a category mistake.)⁵² Indeed, in the EL, the first thing he says about metaphysics in general is that it is ingenuous or naïve (*unbefangen*), because—and here Hegel gives his own version of the true critical project—it is unaware “of the antithesis of thinking within and against itself” (*des Gegensatzes des Denkens in und gegen sich*, EL §26).⁵³ To forestall any impression that his own logic is continuous with rationalist metaphysics, Hegel requires an expression that avoids the impression that thoughts are kinds of things, or have fixed, self-related properties. (In EL §30, he characterizes metaphysical notions as “representations” because they assume “ready made subjects” (*fertig gegebene Subjekte*). So he suggests “thought-determinations” (*Denkbestimmungen*), a phrase that at least opens up the question of the “determining” activity that results in such determi-

51. See Jaeschke’s (2010, 224) concise formulation. Hegel’s letter to Niethammer at the time of the publication of the first volume of the *Logic*, cited by Jaeschke, leaves little room for doubt about Hegel’s views on his relation to Kant on logic and metaphysics.

52. This of course does not exhaust the question of Hegel’s relationship to “special metaphysics,” the world as a totality, the soul, and God. The most difficult issue concerns his understanding of the relationship between the concept and its “actuality” and the traditional ontological argument. Typical of his approach on the latter is 12.127–28, where he notes that the ontological argument is an example of a logical issue—only one example. This makes everything much more difficult, but I see no evidence that Hegel is trying to *address* and resolve in a new way the questions of world, soul, and God in the traditional sense (cf. Bowman 2013, 78), as he is showing us what “takes the place” of such questions, what their very logic depends on, as in the rejection of the very idea that the soul can be a “thing,” whether material or immaterial. See Wolff’s (1992) definitive account, which seems to be the model for all such issues in Hegelian special metaphysics.

53. Bowman (2013) tries to give a positive reading to *unbefangen*, arguing it could mean “untrammelled” (82).

nations, the course of the “movement” of the *SL*. And of course we need to remember again the formulation quoted earlier, “As science, truth is pure self-consciousness as it develops itself and has the shape of the self” (21.33).

Conceptual Activity

Our question is the relation between logic and metaphysics in Hegel’s *SL*, and we are taking our bearings from the relation between self-conscious judging in Kant and what Kant called the “objective validity of the categories.” The attempt has been to understand the Kantian claim about apperception as a logical, not psychological claim, and this goes some way toward understanding the link between this reflective character of judging as the essence of intelligibility and “the intelligibles.” If it is possible to establish that certain a priori judgments have such objectivity, but without Kant’s limitation thesis, restricting that thesis to possible objects of sense experience (phenomena, not noumena), we will have a way into Hegel’s claim that logic can be understood as metaphysics. Our claim about Kant was that even for him, this relation to objects is not established by the imposition of subjective form onto received sensory material. Kant’s position is not ‘impositionist’ in this sense, and both he and Hegel are following the nonimpositionist, more Aristotelian (hylomorphic) line. We have already quoted the “same function” passage from the *Critique of Pure Reason* A79, and there are others of the same tenor. At B138, in the second-edition transcendental deduction, Kant writes,

The synthetic unity of consciousness is therefore an objective condition of all cognition, not merely something I myself need in order to cognize an object but rather something under which every intuition must stand in order to become an object for me.

And he works hard to insist that this is not turning the question of objectivity into the question of subjectively necessary unity.

For, e.g., the concept of cause, which asserts the necessity of a consequent under a presupposed condition, would be false if it rested only on a subjective necessity, arbitrarily implanted in us, of combining certain empirical representations according to such a rule of relation. I would not be able to say that the effect is combined with the cause in the object (i.e., necessarily), but only that I am so constituted that I cannot think of this represen-

tation otherwise than as so connected; which is precisely what the skeptic wishes most, for then all of our insight through the supposed objective validity of our judgments is nothing but sheer illusion. (B167–68)

As we discussed earlier, Hegel thinks of anything's principle of intelligibility, its conceptual form, in the same way, as an actualization, the being-at-work or *energeia* of a kind of thing's distinct mode of being, not as a separable immaterial metaphysical object. We can even say that Hegel's presentation of judgment is one

according to which the act of finite subjectivity that is the act of judging as Kant describes it is the mere phenomenal manifestation of an act of self-thinking and self-accomplishing which is that of being itself, considered in its totality.⁵⁴

We need only remember that for Hegel *this is the core of Kant's own position* once we give up any notion of separable contributions from sensibility and understanding, and give up referring to pure forms of intuition as species-specific and so "subjectivizing" and idealizing "limitations" on what we can know. If we do, we get the careful statements about the identity within difference of concept and being in and for itself with which we began chapter 2, and which evoke Kant's Highest Principle of Synthetic Judgments. There is no indication that Hegel thinks that being or God has an apperceptive discursive intellect and that we are manifestations of it. We are manifestations of the finitude of *Verstand* and the possibility inherent in *Verstand* of the transcendence of such self-imposed finitude. And all of these speculative identity claims have to be consistent with what Hegel tells us about the objectivity of concepts at the beginning of the logic of the Concept:

This is an objectivity which the subject matter consequently attains in the concept, and this concept is the unity of self-consciousness into which that subject matter has been assumed; consequently its objectivity or the concept is itself none other than the nature of self-consciousness, has no other moments or determinations than the "I" itself. (12.18–19)

Where Hegel differs from Aristotle (and from Kant in a different way) is that he does not think the determinacy of this "it" can be settled by individual acts of intellectual apprehension, what he later called "empty identity or abstract

54. Longuenesse 2007, 217.

universality" (12.22). This is something that follows from seeing them as moments in the I's self-determination of its own possibility. They must also be understood as moments in a network of thought's determination of its own possibilities, a vast claim we have yet to approach.

This should give us more purchase on the kind of passages quoted in the last chapter. To wit:

This concept is not intuited by the senses, is not represented in imagination; it is only subject matter [*Gegenstand*], the product and content of thought, the fact that exists in and for itself [*die an und für sich seyende Sache*], the logos, the reason of that which is, the truth of what we call things; it is least of all the logos that should be kept outside the science of logic. (SL 21.17)

And,

When thinking is taken as active with regard to objects as the thinking over [*Nachdenken*] of something, then the universal—as the product of this activity—contains the value of the matter [*Wert der Sache*], what is essential [*das Wesentliche*], inner, true. (EL §21)

In other words, we need a kind of stereoscopic vision to keep in mind two aspects of this issue that Hegel keeps stressing, and as complementary rather than conflicting. The first is that conceiving is an activity and concepts are "moments" of this activity. This is something stressed in a different way when Hegel tells us that concepts are not things, objects. The second is that, as just stressed, such activities are not actions, doings, and that Kant's position, when properly understood (and so not as Kant understood it), should not be taken as a part of a two-step or impositionist account of such activity. The inseparability of concept and intuition is the contrary of such a position.

Similarly, the concept is also not to be considered here as the act of the self-conscious understanding, not as subjective understanding. (12.20)

The emphasis in this passage is thus on the distinctness of the understanding as a model of conceptual activity, and its Kantian status as subjective, imposing an order on what is given.⁵⁵

55. When, in his *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, Hegel discusses the notion of form as activity (*Tätigkeit*), he aims a remark at Fichte, who claimed great originality for his view on this.

The Objectivist Hegel?

I noted at the outset that Hegel tells us that two-thirds of the *Logic*, the Objective Logic, concerns, at least in part, Kant's understanding of "transcendental logic."⁵⁶ (This is also broadly reflected in the structure of the Logic of Being, which has at its core a consideration of Kant's categories of quality and quantity, and even Kantian subcategories like reality, negation, and limitation, and in the logic of essence, which tracks Kant's consideration of the categories of relation and modality.⁵⁷) But what is most important is that he also tells us that we should understand the import or result of this logic *just as Kant did*, as a critique of and a successor to what had been "metaphysics."⁵⁸

And he echoes and affirms Kant's famous insistence that the proud name of ontology must give way to the more modest one of a transcendental analytic (A247/B304). Hegel says that (Kant's) objective or transcendental logic "replaces," stands in the place of (*an deren Stelle . . . tritt*), general metaphysics or ontology. Logic so construed also takes account of and replaces special metaphysics, the a priori doctrines of the soul, the world, and God. And finally Hegel pronounces on the justness of the Kantian critique of such enterprises in a strikingly direct way.

[Metaphysics] . . . therefore incurred the just reproach [*den gerechten Vorwurf*] that it employed the pure forms of thought uncritically, without pre-

Hegel notes that someone could claim this only out of "ignorance of the Aristotelian Concept." JA 18, 325. Rohs (1982, 28) notes that the target is Fichte.

56. I mentioned earlier the unusual way in which Hegel sometimes seems to conflate the positions of Aristotle and Kant on form, and I tried in this chapter to say what he might have meant. Bowman (2013) argues that because Hegel claimed the Wolffian system was the final form of dogmatic metaphysics, "then surely the structure of his *Science of Logic* is a reflection of it" (68). He goes on to say that the objective logic "takes the place of ontology as conceived in pre-Kantian metaphysics." I agree, but when Hegel uses that phrase, "takes the place of," at 21.48, he is explaining the passage at 21.47 where he referred us to Kant's transcendental logic to understand his objective logic. Bowman cites no text to justify the claim that both Kant and Hegel are trying to "revitalize" or "renew" Wolff's dogmatic rationalism, and it seems to me that such claims are inconsistent with the "take the place of" language Bowman himself uses. For Bowman's interesting views on the relation between transcendental logic and speculative logic, see 106ff.

57. In the first edition of the *SL*, Hegel lays out the "general division of being" without mentioning Kant (11.41), but he points out in the second edition (21.41) that his own treatment will diverge from Kant's "ordering and meaning of the categories."

58. Since Hegel is forever trying to avoid the Kantian view that metaphysics rests on some kind of mistake that can be corrected, he also uses his own formulations about "the science of things in thought" to praise the intuition of "the old metaphysics," or at least its general dynamic, its anti-empiricism. See 21.29.

viously investigating whether and how they could be the determinations of the thing-in-itself, to use Kant's expression — or more precisely, of the rational. — The objective logic is therefore the true critique of such determinations — a critique that considers them, not according to the abstract form of the a priori as contrasted with the a posteriori, but in themselves according to their particular content. (*SL* 21.49)

These passages are so pellucid, it is hard to believe there is a controversy about Hegel's debt to Kant's metaphysics critique, but there is.⁵⁹ Now, it is also true that these expressions of Kantian loyalties introduce a huge problem, one that will occupy us for the rest of this book in one way or another. If we think, as some do, of Hegel's *Denkbestimmungen* as something like Fregean thoughts, objective in the Platonic sense, as abstract entities, then what I am quoting is very puzzling. Hegel certainly knows that Kant's transcendental logic is in some sense or other a logic of subjectivity. He can't be saying: I agree with Kant's critique of school metaphysics, except for all the details of Kant's critique, except for the basis on which the critique is grounded.⁶⁰ What we will need is a Hegelian notion of objectivity and objective thoughts that is not inconsistent with what he is saying in these passages.

That is, given what Hegel has said about the temporal dimensions of the "movement" of the *SL*, for example that it even parallels the history of philosophy, it would be odd for Hegel to defend a position according to which such conceptual content is fixed and eternal, à la Frege.⁶¹ Fixed and eternal is exactly what he most of all does not want. The rough contrary idea will be: just as those Frege interpreters argue that there is no reason to go as far as the historical Frege did (a form of Platonism) to differentiate objective thought from mental episodes, private associations, etc., as "senses," and just as we might explain understanding a sense not as grasping the same abstract object but as having come to have the capacities anyone would have to have to use the expression of that sense successfully (as when M. Dummett suggests parsing objectivity in Frege as possibly "intersubjectivity"), the same might

59. There are, of course, plenty of robust, accurate statements of what I regard as the heart of the matter. See Hyppolite 1997, 58; Longuenesse 2007, 16.

60. A proviso is necessary here. At the end of *EL* §31, Hegel makes a distinction between scholastic and modern metaphysics and "Greek thinking," which he characterizes as "free" and "at home with itself." He does not explain what he means but we shall have to return to the topic.

61. I do not mean here to enter the controversies about Frege, Kantianism, and idealism. I take myself to be referring to a standard or at least widely accepted view, perhaps best exemplified by Brandom (1986): "Frege does insist that thoughts are independent, not just of this thinker or that, but of the very existence or even possibility of thinkers at all" (275).

be true of Hegelian objectivity.⁶² As the phrase above, “determinations of the rational,” indicates, Hegel would have no trouble affirming Frege’s claim,

So I understand by objectivity an independence from our sensing, intuiting and representing . . . but not an independence from reason.⁶³

And it is certainly the case, as that “or more precisely, of the rational” indicates, that while Hegel accepts the justness of the Kantian charge against the “old metaphysics,” that it was “uncritical” in the Kantian sense, he does not accept the form of the Kantian critique. In a claim we shall have to return to and investigate, he repeats often that the true critical question is not whether subjective forms of thought have any objective purchase, but whether the concepts of a logic “in and for themselves” provide what they are supposed to provide: what is required for successful conceptual determination. In both sections of the objective logic, we will find that they do not (or rather partly do and partly do not). So when conceptual determination is understood as it is in the logic of being and in the logic of essence, the resources available to the conceptual forms themselves will turn out to be inadequate to make the distinctions and hold them stable, the ones that, at any point in the journey, we have determined we have to be able to make. A simpler way to put the point is the way Hegel does early on in the *SL*: Kant did not sufficiently investigate *what these pure concepts are*; he did not pursue the question of their “nature” and their very possibility.⁶⁴ All of this by way of saying that

62. See Moore (2012, 212) and his citation of the passages in Dummett. (Moore himself has the view of Hegel I am disputing, the one, I claim, incompatible with the references to Kant, particularly, as we shall see, with Hegel’s claim that the structure of the concept is the structure of self-consciousness.)

63. Frege 1986, 41: “So verstehe ich unter Objectivität eine Unabhängigkeit von unserm Empfinden, Anschauen und Vorstellen . . . , aber nicht eine Unabhängigkeit von der Vernunft.” Wolff (2013, 99n23) claims the possibility of a Hegelian influence on Frege through Frege’s teacher, Kuno Fischer.

64. Wolff makes the interesting point that although Hegel did criticize Kant’s conception of categories as subjective forms of thought, his deeper concern was rather like Jacobi’s at least in one respect: that these forms were “finite,” inadequate to think “the infinite.” To get this right, we have to understand that such concepts are not representations that we have, not mental operations or products of mental operations, or special sorts of things. They are “objective thoughts,” Wolff suggests, rather as they are in Frege. And he quotes Frege (1986, 41), cited above. Bowman (2013, 16) makes a similar point, and it is one of the major themes in his book. This is a useful suggestion, but basing anything on it will depend on, as just indicated, how one interprets Frege on objectivity, and on the final status of Hegelian subjectivity and its compatibility with that notion, such as it is, in Frege.

there is no question that in Hegel's eyes, the charge of subjectivity or finitude against the Kantian position must be earned. And, as he states in EL §25, it is by means of the development of unavoidable "antitheses" in such determinations that this subjectivity or finitude will be shown.⁶⁵

Commentators are sometimes so eager to observe the spirit of this sort of critique of Kantian "subjectivism" that they assume that the *Logic* is something like the "pure" manifestation of the objective dependence and implication relations among "pure essentialities," thoughts in the objective sense, logical entities that are in those relations in ways that have nothing to do with anyone "thinking them." The worry among such objectivists was stated very well by Dieter Henrich in 1971, in a criticism of Kuno Fischer's version of logic. Any interpretation, Henrich insisted, that explains the movement of the *Logic* in terms of the being-thought, or the thinking of thoughts (and our insistence on concepts as predicates of possible apperceptive judgments would be a prime offender) conflates the method of the *Phenomenology* with the *Logic*. Now it is certainly true that the reflective enterprise that propels the *Logic* should not be confused with what Hegel would call "external reflection" (something like selecting a concept and trying to define it). And it is certainly true that Hegel writes,

This method is not something distinct from its subject matter and content—for it is the content [*Inhalt*] in itself, the dialectic which it possesses within itself, which moves the subject matter forward. It is clear that no expositions can be accepted as scientifically valid that do not follow the progression of this method and are not in tune with its simple rhythm, for it is the course of the subject matter itself [*Gang der Sache selbst*]. (*SL* 21.38)

But the apperceptive or inherently reflexive determination of conceptual content—in the later language of the *SL*, a positing, and then ultimately determining reflection—is *no more external than the "I think" is external to a content thought*. Judgment and the consciousness of judgment are one act. No content represents anything except as thought/judged. This will be crucial in avoiding what would seem to be a reflective paradox in the *Logic*'s project: that the forms of pure thinking supposedly under investigation are also necessary to do the investigating.

65. See 12.25 for Hegel's formulation of the problem of the "derivation" (*Herleitung*) of the concepts, and his somewhat ironic interjection, "if one wants to call it a derivation."

So Henrich's worry and the similar worries of those who follow him manifest several confusions. They first conflate the phenomenological *experience* (*Erfahrung*) of some norm, as such experience is treated in the *PhG* (what it is like, from the first-person perspective, to attempt to account for something or justify some deed, within the boundaries of some putative, finite norm), with the pure thinking, thinking as such, the moments of reason, in the *Logic*.⁶⁶ The movement of pure thought is like the movement in a proof, on the assumption that the moves are inferences a thinker, on pain of contradiction, must make, and not merely formal-structural functions, as in a symbolic logic. This is what Hegel means when he characterizes the logical dimension of subjectivity:

the concept that has carried itself out [*sich selbst ausgeführt*] in its objectivity, or the object that is inner purposiveness, essential subjectivity [*wesentliche Subjektivität*]. (EL §214A)

Expressed in a different terminology, it is also question-begging to assume that anyone who makes the assertoric force inseparable from the logical structure of the unit of meaning (as Hegel unquestionably does) is

66. Henrich 1971, 82. There is no reason to worry that the approach suggested here would mean that "reflective thought-determinations," or a form of understanding available only later in the book, is being in some way illicitly invoked at this stage of the *Logic* (84). Henrich admits they are in fact in play, as he must. Even immediacy is, after all, what is not mediated, the negation of mediation, and so itself mediated in a way. And "equality" appears to be a two-term predicate, and so also mediated. But as Houlgate (2006, 79–83) points out, in a clear summary of Henrich's position, Henrich tries to argue that these reflective categories are also self-canceling as reflective; they are invoked to be canceled. Immediacy is "*indeterminate*" immediacy, and this means not the immediacy determinate by its contrast with mediation, but something *wholly* indeterminate. And "equality" is equality with self, again a negation of the two-place or reflective equality. But this leaves us with pure semantic emptiness, not a speculative *Nichts*. A concept of immediacy that is said to be "not the immediacy determinate by its negation of mediation," but *just not that*, is wholly useless as an analytical moment in the *Logic*. It just means: an immediacy that is not any *sort* of immediacy at all, or an equality that is not a determinate equality. Concepts with no determinate content are indistinguishable from an infinity of likewise empty notions. We might as well introduce square circles. I think it is more plausible to admit that reflective categories certainly are being invoked, but that the presuppositions, the logical equipment, of these first stages of an objective logic do not allow them to be acknowledged as such, except in so far as thoughts are considered objects, exactly the failing, for Hegel, of Greek metaphysics before Aristotle. Henrich, that is, although he certainly accepts that the full justification of Hegel's beginning and its first movement can come only at the end of the *Logic*, is responding to and resisting reflective interpretations from the standpoint of the logic of being, not from the standpoint of (what we will later learn to be) the *Logic*. And I think Houlgate is following him. In Henrich's case he is worried about this *Logic/PhG* confusion, but I have said why I think that is a red herring. Houlgate (2006, 272–74) repeats this criticism of Henrich's.

thereby guilty of psychologism, or of relying on some “experiential” standard of adequacy. Even Frege was willing to make the question of assertoric force a part of “logic” in his own terms.⁶⁷ In this respect, though, there is something quite relevant from the *Phenomenology*, the remarks on the “speculative sentence” in its preface.

The proposition ought to express what the true is, but essentially ‘the true’ is subject. As this subject, it is merely the dialectical movement, this course of self-engendering, advancing, and then returning into itself. (*PhG* §65)

Whatever this ultimately means, it clearly distinguishes something like the inspection of logical structure from the true bearer of Hegel’s notion of truth, the *movement* of judgmental activity.⁶⁸ Moreover, if we follow Henrich’s advice, we end up with the position he in fact attributes to Hegel, that the *Logic* concerns the development or movement of *the objects of the logical science*.⁶⁹ But this — *objects* moving about — is a mystification. At any rate, I have no idea what it would be to “observe” one thought-object developing into another.⁷⁰ (We don’t observe what happens when one step in a proof “becomes” another; the inference has to be *drawn*, and drawn for a reason.) Such an objectivism makes it almost impossible to understand what Hegel calls the *Logic*’s inner “drive” or *Trieb* (or the comment just quoted, that “the true is subject”),⁷¹ and it especially does not take account of the claim that

67. Tolley, forthcoming.

68. We shall have to return to this issue in the discussion of the logic of the Concept. Hegel himself distinguishes strongly between the proposition (as the potential object of attitudes like imagining, hoping, remembering, and asserting) and the judgment at 12.55–12.56. He even denies that most of what we would normally consider judgments are judgments, because they involve mere “representations,” and so only such representation-based claims can be analyzed through the Kantian notion of synthesis.

69. This is not even to broach the issue raised by Theunissen (1980, 80) and Bubner (1976, 39), that one should be cautious about radically distinguishing the *PhG* and the *SL*. Theunissen even characterizes all of the “objective logic” as a phenomenology.

70. This is an old bone of contention about the *SL*, the issue of movement (*Bewegung*), and in the nineteenth century, when a speculative logic was taken as a serious idea, there were many attempts to make sense of it “objectively,” some fairly extreme. Trendelenberg, Erdmann (who seems to have thought that objects turned into concepts, like water into wine), Weinholdt, George, E. v. Hartmann, all had a try. See the summary in section 4 of Bubner 1976.

71. Another formulation that helps explain such a *Trieb*: “it is part of the concept of judging in general that it includes the representation of itself as at least a capacity for a certain act” (Blecher 2013, 61). This apperceptive requirement is crucial to Kant’s analysis of formal modality (the problematic, assertoric, and apodictic “value” [*Wert*] of judgment). Judgments cannot have this modal character except that I apperceive such a value in judging, and in so apperceiving understand the

conceptual form is itself apperceptive, that “the truth is self-consciousness.” (The *SL* after all is the “science of pure thinking,” not the science of pure thoughts.) Essentialities do not move or establish relations with other essentialities, any more than *modus ponens* describes “what happens” in thought, or what one phenomenologically experiences, when $p \rightarrow q$ and p are both true and taken to be true. But acknowledging that does not mean that the objective thought $p \rightarrow q$ and the objective thought p “become” the objective thought q . What could that mean?⁷²

The general picture here seems to be a propositional attitude point of view, in which thought contents are self-standing, complex objects, which can then become the objects of various attitudes like believing or asserting. But Hegel is pre-Fregean, and has no trouble regarding the assertoric force as essential to the identity of the *content* thought. A proposition cannot be the bearer of truth, does not even represent any state of affairs, except as judged, and therewith the identity of the acts of thinking involve a wide variety of other commitments at the same time, something that cannot be explained in a “propositionalism.”⁷³ (I mean such things as being committed to the denial

limitation of each of the first two, itself not possible without a “Trieb” or impulse to overcome the limitation. Compare Leibniz: “There is a certain urge for existence or [so to speak] a straining towards existence in possible things or in possibility or essence itself; in a word, essence in and of itself strives for existence.” Quoted in Blecher 2013, 60.

72. I have the same problem with formulations like this from Düsing (2011), which are not at all untypical in many commentators’ summations of Hegel’s position:

It then becomes clear, however, that being, determinate being, being-for-itself (*Fürsichseiendes*), substance (*Substantielle*), etc. are ontological meaning-contents, in which infinite, divine subjectivity purely thinks and determines itself, but whose contents it, as concept and idea transcends. (113)

“Ontological meaning-contents” are exactly what speculative conceptual content is not, and this theological reference reestablishes a *jenseits* or metaphysical beyond that it is the point of all of Hegel to reject. It is true that in EL §85, Hegel says that the determinations of being “may be looked upon” as “the metaphysical definitions of God,” but he immediately points out that the form of such an expression (“these determinations are the defining marks of God”) makes inappropriate use of the standard predicate form, and so substantivizes God. What he, in contrast, is trying to say, and what the course of the *Logic* throughout the third book manifests, is that all the representation of “God” really amounts to is the totality of thought-determinations considered as absolute. Likewise with the famous passage where Hegel says, “logic is to be understood as the system of pure reason, as the realm of pure thought. This realm is truth unveiled, truth as it is in and for itself. It can therefore be said that this content is the exposition of God as he is in his eternal essence before the creation of nature and of a finite spirit” (21.34). This is surely a reference to the “God of the philosophers,” a God who essentially is “the system of pure reason . . . the realm of pure thought.”

73. This is somewhat compressed, but it will recur as an issue. I am greatly indebted, here and throughout, to Irad Kimhi’s treatment of these issues in his *Thinking and Being*.

of all judgments inconsistent with the one that one asserts as true, and this not as a second act of thought.) By contrast, the basic unit of intelligibility for Hegel is not an internally complex object, even if in relations with other objects, but as he says in many ways and many different times, a *result*, the accomplishment of the “active universal,” which activity is judging. The Absolute itself is said to be a result.

So this is the objectivist temptation I think we most need to resist. It is what Hegel himself is trying to avoid when he spends so much time delimiting the topic of “thinking” from any psychological connotation, both here and in the *Encyclopedia*’s very different treatment of thinking in psychology. And such an objectivist approach flies in the face of Hegel’s frank admission of the role of subjectivity in the movement of the *Logic* (once we understand its nonpsychological status), even the form of subjectivity treated in the *Phenomenology*, *Geist*. Here is a claim Hegel makes “as a logician,” let us say.

The understanding determines, and holds the determination fixed. Reason is negative and dialectical, since it dissolves the determinations of the understanding into nothing; it is positive, since it generates the universal, and comprehends the particular therein. Just as the understanding is usually taken as something separate from reason in general, so also dialectical reason is taken as something separate from positive reason. In its truth reason is however spirit, which is higher than both reason bound to the understanding and understanding bound to reason. (*SL* 21.8)

These are all supposed to be logical claims, as Hegel understands logic. He here even identifies *a modality of thinking activity* essential to the identity of the logical moments that he sets out elsewhere: determination and the understanding; dialectic and reason; spirit and speculation. All this even though spirit is not a category of the logic. The mode of logical connection is inseparable from the mode of connecting. They are co-constituting.

One nicely Hegelian formulation of what this amounts to is in fact given by Frege.

Not everything is an idea. Otherwise psychology would contain all the sciences within it, or at least it would be the supreme judge over all the sciences . . . Neither logic nor mathematics has the task of investigating minds and the contents of consciousness owned by individual men. Their task

could perhaps be represented rather as the investigation of *the* mind; of *the* mind, not of minds.⁷⁴

Perfect Hegelianism. Now of course it is also true that “metaphysics” can be understood in any number of ways, and nothing so far cited by Hegel would be inconsistent with some claim that this “new logic” that Hegel is proposing coincides with a *new* metaphysics. Indeed, there is an obvious undeniable sense in which what Hegel is doing can be described as metaphysical. Manifestly, Hegel has philosophical views on the nature of human agency (on what it is), on freedom, necessity, the nature of nature and the nature of spirit, the nature of universality, what a human individual consists in, and so forth. The *Logic* is certainly an account of “the nature of thinking.” The only point at issue here is that our citation of passages has shown that Hegel identifies the old metaphysics with what Kant opposed (“ontology” in the pre-Kantian sense, and a priori doctrines of the soul, the world, and God), that he agrees that Kant replaced these notions with a transcendental logic, and that Kant was right that the old metaphysics was “uncritical,” could not explain how it knew what it claimed to know, even though Kant misformulated the true “critical” problem as the problem of the objective validity of subjective concepts.⁷⁵ The interpretive point to take away from such passages is just that no interpretation of Hegel can be successful that is not consistent with these remarks about the old metaphysics and the new logic (especially the implications that follow from the self-conscious character of judgment). In order to be consistent, what we will be interested in in Hegel’s metaphysics is what role, say, a putative concept of agent such as a natural-causal account could play in a satisfying explanation of the bodily movements we want to attribute to someone in a context where that explanation must be consistent both with others already established and with specific desiderata, or whether a notion of freedom as uncaused causality can cohere with what else we require in the network of notions like responsibility, control over the future, blame,

74. Frege 1984, 368–69.

75. One sometimes reads that there is an “anti-metaphysical” interpretation of Hegel, and I am sometimes held to be responsible for it. The term is virtually meaningless unless we know what conception of metaphysics one takes Hegel to be rejecting, and I have tried to state what sort in this paragraph. Moreover, this attribution to my 1989 book, besides being inaccurate, ignores similar, very important contributions to an attempt to understand what Hegel means by saying that metaphysics is “now” “logic.” Fulda, Falk, Bubner, Theunissen, Wolff, Longuenesse’s original French book, Rohs are just a few examples of what was a widespread attempt in the 1980s.

or whether we have given any account of anything by appealing to “being.” Said another way, a strong way of insisting that Hegel’s new “metaphysics” is a logic, none of any of this has to do with what anything is made of, consists in, with the furniture of the universe. What we want to know, *pace* Hegel, about these concepts is their “logic,” how they function with account-givings governed by the norms of explanatory satisfactoriness and truth.

I conclude the following: to consider objects in terms of their possible intelligibility requires an account of conceptual determination. Concepts are understood as possible “moments” of judgment; their determinacy derives from their role in judgments. They are predicates of possible judgments, and this rendering intelligible occurs most clearly but not exclusively (and not ultimately in speculative knowledge) in the act of predication. Such an account presupposes specific assumptions both about what it is to render intelligible (to judge, to conceptualize), and about the proper objects of thought. Any (particular and limited) version of such thinking must assume such thinking to be apperceptive, implicitly self-conscious, even if from the point of view of the position under analysis, this is not acknowledged. And for Hegel this is a logical claim (about what could count as thinking a thought), not a psychological one, or a metaphysical one (what sort of event is thinking?). This means that any concept of thinking and of the content of thought involves normative proprieties, exclusions, and implications, without which any thinking a thought could not be the thinking and the thought it is. These normative commitments are independent of what a thinker might herself at some moment be able to acknowledge, but they cannot be denied on being noticed, on pain of incoherence, of not thinking anything at all. A simple example is that anyone committed to the truth of a proposition is committed to the denial of every proposition inconsistent with that proposition. That denial is not a separate step that requires its own justification. This feature of thinking is central to *The Science of Logic*’s own development, and that provides us with our next topic. That development essentially involves a demonstration that commitment to a categorical determination, at a given stage of incomplete self-consciousness about what such determination involves, requires a commitment to a thought that appears inconsistent with, “antithetical” to, the original commitment. The “engine” of the *Logic*’s motion is thus negation, in particular a form of self-negation that Hegel thinks he has identified in a way that marks his signal contribution to these sets of issues. That is the notion we have to look at next, at least for some preliminary orientation.

LOGIC AND NEGATION

The Manifold Senses of Negation

Hegel is willing to say some extraordinary things about the concept he sometimes calls “negation,” sometimes “negativity.” What he has been taken to mean has been the source of most of the criticism of Hegel: that he confused logical negation with actual opposition, as in the oppositions of forces or magnitudes in general in the world; that he thought everything in the world contradicted itself, and so believed that pairs of contradictory judgments could both be affirmed; or simply that what he said about negation and contradiction cannot be coherently understood. And any commentator must also face the fact that he invoked the notion of negation in many different contexts in many different ways. So the first task is to have in view that variety of contexts before we can understand what they all might have in common (if anything).

There are five contexts that I want to summarize briefly before attempting an overall interpretation. There is first the claim that *thinking itself* should be understood as a “negating” activity. This is meant in two senses. One concerns the “negative” dimension of the judging act itself; the other concerns why Hegel would think that any individual act of determination (or predication) should itself be understood as a kind of negating. It is certainly not intuitively clear what asserting that *S is P* might have to do with negation in either of these senses. The second context of discussion will be more marked for further discussion later than explored here (it involves what I have called

the question of the “bearing” of the *SL* on a kind of emancipation): this is the link evident in many remarks between the “power of the negative” and “freedom.” The third will turn out to be the crux of the matter: why and how the determinate content of any concept is primarily intelligible *contrastively*, in its negative relation with, and so a kind of dependence on, what it is not. (In the logic of being, this is a contrast with its contraries, square with non-square or circle, and not with everything not square, like elephant.) This is again an intuitively difficult issue: why should something like *S’s being S*, and *so its not being non-S* have anything to do with opposition or dialectic? We will see some of the importance of this notion by understanding briefly the role it plays in the structure of the three logics. The fourth context in which negation is introduced connects the concept to Hegel’s understanding of speculative truth. And the fifth involves the knotty problem of contradiction.

Thinking as Negating

Here is a typical passage in which Hegel associates thinking with negating:

The understanding determines, and holds the determination fixed. Reason is negative and dialectical, since it dissolves the determinations of the understanding into nothing; it is positive, since it generates the universal, and comprehends the particular therein. Just as the understanding is usually taken as something separate from reason in general, so also dialectical reason is taken as something separate from positive reason. In its truth reason is however spirit, which is higher than both reason bound to the understanding and understanding bound to reason. *It is the negative*, that which constitutes the quality of both the dialectical reason and the understanding: it negates the simple, thereby posits the determinate difference of the understanding; but it equally dissolves this difference, and so it is dialectical. (21.8, my emphasis)

Hegel already spoke of “the tremendous power of the negative” in the Jena *Phenomenology* and simply identified it, in a way of great importance to this study, with “*the energy of thought, of the pure I*.” In the first edition of the *SL*, in a remark he left out of the 1831 revision, he calls negation “the truly real and being-in-itself” (*das wahrhafte Reale und Ansichseyn*) and writes that negativity is the “abstract foundation of all philosophical ideas and speculative

thinking in general,” and that it is only in our time, the “new time,” that we have even begun to understand it (11.77). When, in the last volume of the *Logic*, he comments on this “new” understanding of his, he is as clear about its supreme importance as he is difficult to understand.

Now the negativity just considered constitutes the turning point of the movement of the concept. It is the simple point of the negative self-reference, the innermost source of all activity [*Tätigkeit*], of living and spiritual self-movement [*Selbstbewegung*]; it is the dialectical soul which everything true possesses and through which alone it is true; for on this subjectivity [*Subjektivität*] alone rests the sublation [*Aufhebung*] of the opposition between concept and reality, and the unity which is truth. (12.246)

One aspect of what he means, especially his identification of negativity with “*the energy of thought, of the pure I*,” and the striking reference to “subjectivity,” has already emerged from the discussion in the last chapter. The apperceptive character of judging is what accounts for this characterization of the judging act itself as having the status of something inherently “negative” as well as positive. Any judgment entails the exclusion of the possibility of many other judgments being true, and this is an aspect of self-conscious judging, a logical element of the judgment as a whole. Hegel wants in the *SL* to give “negativity,” nonbeing, what is not, the ontological status, fullness, or presence of “positive being,” a “logical,” not “phenomenological” treatment. But these are different treatments of the same issue. In the simplest sense, we are talking about the logical structure of apperceptive intentional knowledge, as well as the ontological status of agency. What it means to claim that the intelligibility of any content of empirical knowledge is not a wholly “positive” phenomenon in Hegel’s (Kantian and post-Kantian) way of looking at it is best understood by contrast. If it were not so and were wholly positive, subjectivity would be something like a mere complex registering and responding device (of the same ontological status as a thermometer). That is, conceived now “logically”—that is, not as a problem of perceptual or experiential consciousness itself, but as a *claim* based on perception, an empirical judgment about the world (“there is a red book on the table”)—the claim is that it cannot be such a claim if it is simply wrung out of one by a perceptual episode (call this a “pure positivity” model, not the most felicitous of expressions

but it gets at what Hegel wants to say by his positive-negative contrast).¹ As we have seen, one is *not* simply wholly absorbed in the presence of the world to one, *not* wholly and merely reactive to the stimulation of sensibility, and that “*not*” is the beginning (but certainly not the end) of all the logical issues of negation that emerge in Hegel’s philosophy, at both the phenomenological and the logical level. In making such a judgment I “negate” the mere immediacy or givenness of perceptual content, negate it as immediate and putatively given, and take up, am always taking up, a position of sorts about what is there, what is the case (cf. EL §12A). What thinking is *is* such “negation” of one’s immediate, “positive” state. (One can say: this negation of mere immediacy is “taking a stand,” rather than *being put into a state*.) Any thinking could be a seeming-to-be-the-case, *not* what is the case, and that possibility is constitutive of the act’s being a judging from the outset. That judgment as such is potentially self-negating, rather than merely otherwise determined, does not mean (in the Platonic sense of nonbeing as otherness in *The Sophist*) that a judgment is just “other” than a purely positive responding mechanism. The potential for such self-negation is constitutive of a judgment’s possibility as judgment.

This does not of course mean that a component of any judgment is some reservation one attends to, as if the true, logical form of any judgment were the ridiculously hesitant: “I assert *p*; but, for all I know, I may be wrong.” The constitutive feature attended to in a Hegelian philosophical logic is the fact that judgments are potentially responsive to reasons and revisions *qua* judgments. The fact that they are miscategorized if treated as wholly positive or as mere mental events does not mean that they reside, by contrast, in some domain of nonbeing.² It simply means that asserting something to be the case would not be an *assertion* unless *already*, in its very logical mode of being, open to possible revision. It is this sense of “not wholly positive” that Hegel is trying to find a way to express.

In a passage from the “Berlin Phenomenology” (the section on phenomenology from the Berlin *Encyclopedia*), the connection between the phenomenological point and the logical structure of judgment is clear, even if the exact meaning of that connection is not.

1. Since for both Kant and Hegel perception itself is concept-involving, perception itself must also be said to be apperceptive, but in its distinct way. The two modalities of the actualization of conceptual capacities are different as well as linked, but it is a long story to sort out how to account for these differences and the continuities. See Pippin 2003 and 2007 and McDowell 2007.

2. This is the sophists’ famous mistake in Plato’s dialogue *The Sophist*.

The I is now this subjectivity, this infinite relation to itself, but therein, namely in this subjectivity, lies its negative relation to itself, diremption, differentiation, judgment. *The I judges, and this constitutes it as consciousness; it repels itself from itself; this is a logical determination.* (BPhG 2)³

And in being an agent, I am not simply causally responsive to inclinations and desires; there is no “fullness of positive being” here either. I interrupt or negate merely positive being (what I feel inclined to do, experience as wanting to do) by deliberating and resolving what to do. In Kantian terms, this means that any such inclination cannot count as a reason for an action except as “incorporated” within a maxim, a general policy one has for actions of such a type. So when Hegel reminds us in the preface to the *Phenomenology of Spirit* that we must think “substance” “also as subject,” he does not, it would appear, mean for us to think subject merely as an attribute of substance or an appearance of what remains, basically, substance, or an epiphenomenon of substance. The whole point of speculative idealism is to think *substance* as *not-just-substance* (or what I have been speculatively calling “the fullness of positive being”), and so as the negation of *mere* substance as such; and also to think subject as substance, what is *not-mere-subject* (which would be the Fichte option). A tall order. As noted before, the closest first and general approximation of what he means is Aristotelian: subjectivity (thinking and acting according to norms) is the distinct being-at-work (*energeia*, Hegelian *Wirklichkeit*) of the biological life-form that is the human, reason-responsive substance; this in the same sense in which Aristotle says, if the eye were body, *seeing* would be its form, its distinctive being at work. So should we understand the being-at-work Hegel calls “subject.” But this gets us only so far, and we need to see more of his detailed treatment of the problem in logical terms.

Synthesis and *Ur-teilen*

In order to have some broad overview of what Hegel is trying to say, we have to imagine in a kind of pictorial way how Hegel is inverting (what he takes to be) Kant’s basic model of what I have been loosely calling “rendering intelligible.” Instead of thinking of the fundamental act of understanding as a syn-

3. This is Hegel’s way of making the point he understands Fichte to be making. For more on the relation to Fichte and this issue, see Pippin (2000; 2013b). In his *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, Hegel says that what is essential (*Wesentliches*) in thinking “depends on negation” (JA 19: 374; Rohs 1982, 38).

thesis of independent, originally unrelated elements, either by subsuming an individual under a concept, or by including one concept under another, we should understand ourselves, both in experience and in logical reflection, *beginning* with “wholes,” never with experiential or logical subsentential simples or atoms.⁴ We begin with an original and internally complex unity of some sort, which must be articulated, differentiated, to be intelligible, but that articulation loses, cannot fully express in predicative terms, the original but inarticulate unity, which must be restored (“the judgment is the original division [*Teilung*] of what is originally one” [12.55]).⁵

This partly explains why the beginning of the *SL* looks as it does, the maximally indeterminate, all-comprehensive, and all-inclusive unity (of anything at all), Being, to be determined by a “negation” of such indeterminacy (something that, given Being’s indeterminateness, will not be possible).⁶ The project in the logic of being is to explore the conceptual capacities necessary to render determinate *individuals* intelligible in their individuality. Determinate being (*Dasein*) is (or let us assume now, for the sake of argument, that Hegel has shown it to be) the necessary negation (or further determination) of mere indeterminacy (*Sein*), and determinate being is determinate by virtue of a *particular* form of negation, which Hegel calls *Anderssein*, being-other, or by virtue of contrastive relations with other individuals or other concepts.⁷ These contrasts are made by virtue of both “qualitative” and “quantitative” predicates, and by the “measuring” of quantities in a way that reveals their relation to qualitative discrimination. As we shall see, there is no

4. See the concluding remarks of Wolff (1984, 201), and Sedgwick’s (2012, chap. 2) emphasis on organicism.

5. This is the legacy of Hölderlin in Hegel’s thought that Henrich (1992; 1997) has tracked so carefully. Hegel goes on to claim that the synthetic understanding of judgmental unity is adequate for judgments that involve “mere representations,” but he gives his contrary view in a compressed passage in which that contrary position can be made out, but only dimly. We shall return to it.

The predicate, which is the universal, appears on the contrary as the reflection of this judgment on that object, or rather as the object’s immanent reflection that transcends the immediacy of the judgment and sublates its determinacies as mere existents—appears, that is, as the object’s in-itselfness.—In this way, the start is made from the singular as the first, the immediate, and through the judgment this singular is raised to universality, just as, conversely, the universal that exists only in itself descends in the singular into existence or becomes a being that exists for itself. (12.57–58)

6. And the greater generality required for a predicate to function in determination is obviously not possible here, the argument Aristotle rests on to deny being the status of a highest genus.

7. This is not, could not be, a differentiation from *everything* it is not, but only a differentiation from contrary predicates (for concepts), “opposing” things (for things). More on that shortly.

real explanation (within the assumptions of a logic of being) of why a thing has these properties, which it cannot lose without ceasing to be that thing, and so no account of any relation between the individual and its manifold properties. (The situation here is similar to the one that arises between the chapter on perception and the chapter on the understanding in the *PhG*.) And that will require a “movement” to the logic of essence, in which a thing is not negatively contrasted with other things, or its logical contraries, but is said to be *self-negating*. An essence is other than (“not”) its mere appearances, but must show itself in, is determinate only by reference to, its appearances (which are after all its appearances, not “indifferent” to it).⁸ Hegel calls the logic of essence “pure negativity” (*reine Negativität*).

Negation and Freedom

We have already seen that in the EL, Hegel contrasted his approach with traditional metaphysics by claiming that that enterprise was naïve in not appreciating what his *Logic* would: the “the antithesis of thinking within and against itself” (*des Gegensatzes des Denkens in und gegen sich* [EL §26]).⁹ Thought’s antithesis within and against itself amounts to this “movement of the concept,” that is, what we need to understand to understand how the *Logic* “moves” or, in some sort of inferential, nondeductive way, gets us from point A to point B.¹⁰ And such negativity amounts to “the innermost source of all activity,” the activity being “spiritual self-movement,” and this in a way that will help us understand the sublation of any opposition between concept and reality. That all sets quite a task. The interpretive claim so far has been that, for Hegel, to understand anything “in its truth” is to understand its determinability as just what it is and nothing else, or it is to understand it in the light of its distinctly possible intelligibility, in the light of its concept (its “actuality”). But any such finite concept is also a manifestation of conceptuality itself (of the possibility of conceptual content), and we would not ultimately have understood the determinacy of the thing were we not able to understand such conceptuality, the necessary elements (or “moments”)

8. This is why the “logic of essence” frames the issue as the right way to think about the relation between an agent and her actions, as Yeomans rightly points out. More on this in chapter 6.

9. See also the addition to EL §48: “everything actual contains opposed determinations,” and knowledge consists in becoming conscious of the object “as a concrete unity of opposed determinations.”

10. This is the topic of chapter 7 here.

of any such possible conceptuality. That latter point of view is the *SL*'s, and Hegel now stakes virtually everything on the *self*-determining ("spiritual self-movement") character of the exposition of such moments, and the engine of that movement is supposed to be a special form of negation, "dialectical" negation.

But the following passage, from the discussion of "the Absolute Idea" at the culmination of the argument of the *SL*, is only the beginning of an extraordinary set of claims that build on this notion of negation, to which we shall have to return in detail. For we also need at least to have in mind the way the remarks suddenly explode into a sweeping generalization, for which, I would contend, we do not yet have available in the commentaries even possible lines of interpretation.¹¹

Besides the very general point about the "negative" status of judgment itself as a capacity (its not being merely a state we come to be in), and the point about predication/determination as negation (Spinoza's "*omnis determinatio est negatio*," as at *SL* 21.101), Hegel also introduces the claim that conceptual content itself must be understood as the capacity to use the concept appropriately as the predicate of possible judgments, and, as we see the *Logic* unfold, we see that that especially means to understand what is determinately excluded or negated by such a concept. As he goes on to sketch the most important element of negation in the book, he claims that this "first" act of negation referred to in the 12.246 passage—that a moment of the concept's self-determination depends on a relation to and opposition with its contrary—requires that it must itself be negated, because it involves a kind of "contradiction" (which we have to investigate) that cannot stand, on pain of inconsistency, and that must itself be negated. (Or, the original indeterminate unity must somehow be restored as determinate.) This "negation of negation" is what prompts the ambitious, sweeping claim:

The second negative at which we have arrived, the negative of the negative, is this sublating of contradiction, and it too, just like contradiction, is not an act of external reflection; for it is on the contrary the innermost, objective moment of the life of spirit by virtue of which a subject is a person, is free.
(12.246)

Hegel has clearly not called this self-movement of the concept *subjectivity* in an idle way, and in the context of the passage he clearly does not mean any

11. With the exception of Theunissen's (1980) remarkable effort.

divine or cosmic subjectivity (nor, as always, is he referring to a psychological subjectivity). He says he is talking about the logical status, *persons*. In the same way that judging, insofar as it is genuine, holds open the possibility of its negation or disconfirmation, just by *being* judging, not by virtue of any second, reflective act (all as opposed to its being subject to a later matter-of-fact positive counterdetermination), a deliberation about action, if it is to be a deliberation, is open to the force of reasons the agent has already accepted by deliberating at all, a possibility criterial for his acting at all. It is metaphorical to suggest that there is some ontological realm of “not merely positive being,” and commentators have sometimes been misled by Hegel’s substantivizations and nominalizations, but he is insisting on the logical or categorical requirements of the normative, and in that sense (the sense in which freedom is normatively constrained judgment and rational action), the negative (here only the possibility of not doing what I am powerfully inclined to do) is “that by which a person is free.” (And he does not mean any uncaused causality, but what counts to the subject as a reason.)

This is not to say that there is not a logical dimension to this problem that we will have to consider. This emerges most clearly in the Philosophy of Spirit at §382, when Hegel asserts that “The essence of Geist is formally therefore freedom,” and the appositive for that loaded term, freedom, is “the absolute negativity of the Concept as identical with itself.” (This is another passage where Hegel shows he can turn a phrase. He quotes Jesus as having said, “the truth makes spirit free,” and he himself adds, “freedom makes it [*Geist*] true,” where he means what it truly is to be *Geist*, realized fully as what it is.)

Moreover, in the light of everything we have seen thus far, it should not come as a surprise that shortly after this passage Hegel also yet again praises Kant for having partly understood (without having been able to think it all the way through) that this structure of basic conceptuality (concept, opposition, negation of negation) or this “triplicity” (as Hegel calls it) is the Ur-structure of all conceptual determinacy. He is referring first to Kant’s unexplored claim in the table of categories that a systematic derivation of the table is possible “from a common principle, namely the faculty for judging.” And second, he is referring to Kant’s claim that in each group of three, “the combination of the first and second in order to bring forth the third concept requires a special act of the understanding, which is not identical with that act performed in the first and second” (CPR B111). Hegel has the same ambitions, and clearly considers Kant not to have made good on these promises. (In the EL §§79–82, these are said to be three moments of “the logical,” three

modalities of sense-making: the understanding, dialectic [or first negation], and the speculative [the negation of negation].)

The claim that all of this has to do with the theme of freedom clearly has something to do with what we called, in chapter 1, the “self-authorization” of reason, and is here signaled by references to self-determination and self-movement (that is, to the Fichtean idea that the only possible “determination” of thought is by thought),¹² but that still leaves many questions unanswered. And it clearly bears an important relation to Kant’s famous formulation in the *Groundwork*:

Hence the will is not merely subject to the law but subject to it in such a way that it must be viewed as also giving the law to itself [*selbstgesetzgebend*], and just because of this as first subject to the law (of which it can regard itself as the author).¹³

In terms of the structure of the *Logic*, what Hegel will want to argue is that we cannot adequately explain freedom if we consider just a determinate property that some beings happen to have (as in a logic of being), and we cannot explain it either as a kind of essential ideal, manifest in but never adequately expressed in its appearances, in concrete individual actions (as in the logic of essence). We need the logic of the Concept, in which concepts are said to “give themselves their own content” and be “self-determining” in a way indebted to this Kantian claim on self-legislation, a claim that we should interpret in the way suggested in chapter 2. Any philosophical determination of actuality must be understood as “self-legislating” in the broad sense suggested there: reason relies only on itself in determining such a normative structure. These are not empirical questions. There is no flash of an “essence intuition” (*Wesenschau*) giving access to a world of abstract immaterial objects, essences.

Finally, once we understand this link between thinking and “negating,” we are prepared to understand, or at least to begin to understand, the most difficult and important distinction in a speculative logic according to Hegel. For the heart of that enterprise, the account of, the logic of, pure thinking, understood properly as pure spontaneity, and “as metaphysics,” is the idea of its self-determination of its own moments. If it is possible for pure think-

12. For the details of such an interpretation of Fichte, see Pippin 2000.

13. Kant 1993, 39.

ing to determine what is necessary, what the necessary moments are, of any thinking about what is other than thinking, objects, then we will have to say that any such positing of any such moment, “finitude,” say, in its opposition to infinity, is itself a “negating,” a negating of some sort of indeterminacy in a prior moment, and—and here is the crucial but most difficult part—such a negating must be said to negate itself. In the course of its exposition of itself, it requires of itself what it cannot provide. Such a conception of finitude as the mere other of infinity cannot be defended without self-contradiction, and the duality must be rethought in the section Hegel calls *Für-sich-sein*, being-for-itself. *Darstellung* turns out to be *Kritik*, in Theunissen’s terms. Since what is negated in such a self-negation is itself a negating, we have something quite different from a negating of some positing, or sentence or predicate negating. We have what has been called “autonomous negation,”¹⁴ negation negating itself in a way that has a positive determination and requires a new *Darstellung*.

It could help demystify a bit the strange notion of autonomous self-negation, a negating that negates itself, if we recall, first, that Hegel’s *Logic* takes its bearings from a term or concept logic, but that he takes concepts as having content in being predicates of possible judgments. In effect, the content of each pure concept is articulable only in the judgments in which it is predicable. Concepts can be said to imply, to contain implicitly, various judgmental positions and to exclude others. And second, we can recall Kant on antinomial concepts as a guide for Hegel’s autonomous negation. That is, according to Kant, the concept of the smallest possible particle of matter or a temporal beginning of time requires, when its judgmental structure is exfoliated, the concept of a still smaller particle or a beginning prior to the beginning, that is, requires the infinite divisibility of matter, a concept that, when likewise articulated, requires for its sense in turn a smallest possible particle. The concept “negates itself”—the first self-negation. Each such pure concept must also be the contrary of itself, as Kant shows in his “dialectical” reasoning. They cannot both be true at the same time, although they can both be false. (The third antinomy revolves around subcontraries, which can both be true but cannot both be false together.) But this situation must itself be negated or the concepts could not be said to have any content, which they clearly

14. Henrich 1976 and 1978. At least, this is the extent of my understanding of such autonomous negating. Henrich means a great deal more than I don’t understand.

do. Kant does this by claiming that “transcendental idealism” is what Hegel would consider the “sublation” or *Aufhebung* of the opposition. The details are complicated, but what we need here is just the general notion of a self-undermining concept, the results of which self-undermining can be understood to “negate their own negation”; the concept’s self-explication negates its own negation of itself. In the case of subcontraries, the appearance of self-negation, of the contrariness of the moments of the concept, can itself be negated, rendered not contrary, by transcendental idealism. Such idealism shows how both could be true, but not both false. We will see this notion at work soon in the logic of being. The concept of the general object of judgment, a knowledge claim, is introduced as “being”; or, we begin with the “thought of anything at all.” But as we saw from chapter 3, any such conceiving is conscious of its conceiving, and that means also conscious *that it has conceived nothing at all*, *Nichts*. The Kantian language would be: the thought must be a discursive thought, a *synthesis*. So the first moment is a denial of any intellectual immediacy; thinking must be discursive to be thinking. We find that out by trying to assume otherwise, just the dialectic or apogogic procedure Kant uses in the Antinomies. In Hegel’s treatment, the negation of this negation is the first real moment of determinacy of conceptual content, *Dasein*, or determinate being. More fully said: a concept so introduced is self-negating; and we need to “negate *that* negation” so as to negate the indeterminacy of the mere concept of anything at all. We need something that is what it is by not being what it is not, or *Werden*, becoming. When so self-consciously formulated we have the concept of *Dasein*, determinate being.¹⁵

This way of looking at conceptual “movement” is quite an important structural element in Hegel’s account of the history of art or the history of religion or the history of philosophy or the history of “world history” or of politics. It would mean getting lost in the Hegelian weeds to go too far into this in this context, but we can note that when Hegel explains any moment of “progress” in such a narration, say, the elimination of slavery, and he confronts the objection any radically historical account faces — slavery may have been acceptable for the Romans by their lights, but it was nevertheless wrong, always was, is, always will be — the interesting answer he gives is in line with the structure above. It was actually wrong *by their lights*, implicitly, and they

15. Another and more vivid example would be a concept of freedom whose actualization makes the agent less free (such as, Hegel claims, the moral conception), all requiring not the rejection of the concept, but its determinate transformation so as to avoid just this implication. The paradigmatic example is the transition from morality to ethical life in the *Philosophy of Right*.

struggled to find ways to avoid acknowledging this, a struggle that makes sense only if there was such an intimation of its wrongness. (And so herewith the weeds: we would need to discuss the possibility of collective self-deceit to go into this in any detail, which is just what Hegel does.)¹⁶ But his point is that the Romans' negation of the situation of natural human equality also leads to a negation of that negation, in that it contravenes their own conception of law and its conditions, and that alone requires a new negation/position.¹⁷

So while it is not the most felicitous of expressions — autonomous negation, or the negation of a negation — a great deal in Hegel's whole project rests on the idea behind it.

Logical Movement

I have suggested that the notion of logical "progress" in the *SL*, with that book understood as an account of the necessary elements in sense making or account giving just as such, amounts to a more and more satisfactory exposition of the determinacy of the conceptual resources necessary to provide any such account. This means that there is a basic kind of argument in the demonstration of such determinacy, so that while the three different "logics" differ, they nevertheless share enough features for it to be reasonable to speak of something like a "dialectical" method throughout. That process or argument or method involves some relation between what Hegel calls the self-relatedness or *Selbstbeziehung*, sometimes called the "identity," of some sort of conceptual content involved in the determination in question, and the internal "negation" of that self-sufficiency (the exposition of the dependence of that determinacy on a contrastive relation with contraries or some other sort of contrast or opposition, such as with appearances, or with what Hegel calls being in-and-for-itself), and then the successful negation of that negation.¹⁸

16. See Pippin 2016.

17. What "leads to" means is the subject of chapter 7 later. In the introduction to the *PR*, see the long remark to §3, especially where Hegel points out that the internal inconsistencies in the Roman concepts of law, person, and especially family law were ironically "their greatest virtue." For it was this internal inconsistency, and presumably their ultimate inability to cover over that inconsistency, that allowed them to dissociate themselves (*abweichen*) from "unjust and terrible" (*ungerechten und abscheulichen*) institutions.

18. This of course does not mean that even this vague statement is adequate without further ado; or that, as Falk (1983, 47) points out, we could even say that *Selbstbeziehung* and *Identität* are the same. For one thing, as Falk notes, entities do not relate themselves to themselves; that is a metaphor by Hegel. But a metaphor for what?

In this still vague picture of indeterminate unity and the determinate negation of that unity, we noted that Hegel clearly wants to claim that any such “first” determination must also be seen to be of some logically problematic status. We do not yet know what sort, and why he wants to claim it. We have suggested that in the logic of being it has something to do with the relation between a concept’s “internal” determinacy and its external dependency on exclusion relations with contraries. This results in the contrasts we need—say, between the concepts of the one and the many in the logic of quality, or continuity and discreteness in the logic of quantities—both contrasts being required but, at least under the assumptions of the logic of being, not being successfully makeable. The concepts need to be contrastive, but each *also* seems a “moment” of the intelligibility of the other. (Continuity has to be the continuity of discrete moments; discreteness of a singular substance occurs only within continuities; all of which is crucial for the way Hegel thinks of the Kantian antinomies.) Hence we get that unusual claim in the quotation above, that negation (contrastive differentiation) must *itself* be negated. The original negation, say, between continuity and discreteness, is inadequate as a simple negation (each is not what the other is), and so that understanding of negation, as simply opposed, must be negated. Or with respect to the logic of being as a whole, the model of negation, the “negative” relation in general between an individual and the determinations by virtue of which it is contrasted with what it is not, must itself be negated, not stand as it is, must be rethought. This turns out to mean we need a different account, with a different logic, an account of the relation between a thing understood as a substrate, or an “essence,” and its “appearances.” In contrast to what happens in Kant, *that* essence cannot be unknowable (a mere thing in itself) without a collapse of the position back into mere indeterminacy. Here determinate intelligibility is not a function of relation to others, but now a “self-relation” between essence and *its* appearances, how it “shows” or manifests itself. All of these appearances are *not* what an essence “essentially” is, and yet, if Hegel is right that “essence must appear” in order to be determined as what it is, then that negation (appearances that are not essence) must be “negated” and essence understood in its own possibility, in terms of its basic “concept,” but in a way not indifferent to its appearances.

This summarizes hundreds of pages, but the important point for now is that we recall that any such determining is an apperceptive attempt at predication/determination, and so any such determination is always subject to a reflective assessment of whether the content has in fact been determined. That is the main point that we need. It is why negation (he might

have just said “self-consciousness” or apperception) is said to be “the energy of thought, of the pure I.” Every determination of every sort of content in the *Logic* is a negation of some insufficient determinacy that must be able to be conceived positively (as the negation of the negation) for the determination to be intelligible. That consideration is available at every moment of the *Logic* because we are investigating putative roles in judgment that are assigned, when they are, self-consciously. In the beginning of the logic of being the attempted determination (by means of contrastive relations with other individuals) has not succeeded, we find, and we are off to the races that will lead us to that similar position/negation/negation-of-negation triplicity.

So reflection on what it would be to render anything determinately intelligible, or as Kant said, reflection on the concept of judgment itself, is supposed to be in this way contentfully manifold about the necessary moments in any acts of determination. The indeterminacy of the mere concept of judgment must be negated, its categorical moments specified. But that negation of indeterminacy, the manifold table of categories, must itself be negated as a mere manifold, and the connection with judgment as such must be specified according to a principle. So the Metaphysical Deduction can stand as one good example of how Hegel wants to understand internal negation. Of course, the idea of getting *that* much content out of *that* spare a beginning is staggering, but the entirety of the *SL* proceeds from just such a structured movement in the negation of the first indeterminacy in the book, Being.

Negation and Speculative Truth

We can approach the topic a different way by recalling Hegel’s distinction between something like ordinary truth, or correctness (as when I say it is raining outside and it is), and speculative truth, which in the broadest sense he defines not as the “concept’s agreeing with reality,” but as its “agreeing with itself.” (An example would be: essence “must show [*scheinen*] itself, that it is and is not its appearances.”) Another example would be a “true house,” one that best does what a house is supposed to do, and Hegel gives other examples, like a “true friend.” This refers to the so-called “ontological” conception of truth, not the correspondence or coherence theory. What is important here is the very general model it gives us for understanding the role of “negation” in speculative philosophy. This involves two senses of a thing’s being what it is and also not what it is. The first is the familiar way a decrepit horse could be said to be a horse, but not a true horse, not “really” what a horse should be. In just this sense, with any of the conceptual determinations

of the logic of being for example, each determination is just that determination and not some other, as with the concepts, for example, of “finitude” or “discreteness.” What Hegel wants to show is that, within the resources of a logic of being, finitude, say, cannot be conceptually determined (its content specified) in isolation as just, determinately, finitude alone. It is finitude, but *not* all that finitude must be said to be, in order to be successfully determined as *just that*.¹⁹ Its concept does not agree with itself.

We will be able to understand this better once we have looked at what occurs “on the way” to speculative judgments (or “judgments of necessity”), that is, reflective judgments at home in the logic of essence. These are not judgments like “this is a horse” or “most swans are white,” but like (to use Hegel’s examples in the *Encyclopedia*) “this plant is curative” (it does not just happen to be curative but is so, qua the kind of thing it is); or “this instrument is useful” (does what the instrument is to do, agrees with its concept); or “that form of punishment is a deterrent” (it does what punishment is supposed to do). As we shall see, evaluative judgments, like “this action is good” or our familiar “this is a bad house,” will be paradigmatic examples of judgments in the logic of the Concept. They do not qualitatively specify a thing by distinguishing it from other things; they do not identify the appearances that show the “essence” of the thing; they understand the content “in terms of its concept.” (Again, the *Logic* is concerned not with these judgments per se, but with the metaconceptual conditions of their possibility, the reliance in them on qualitative negation, finitude, essence, appearance, universal, and this is the subject matter of the *SL*.)

What is especially important and difficult is why he thinks a typical determination in the logic of being, qualitative determination as in the examples above, does not adequately determine the thing’s being what it is, why even essential predication (“wolves hunt in packs” as opposed to “some wolves are gray”) also does not adequately determine the thing, but “this house is a good house” or “this punishment is a deterrent” (or, presumably, “this is a fine wolf”) *does* successfully determine. What is difficult is seeing the continuity and so the increasing adequacy in this supposed series, rather than three different sorts of determining predication.

19. Hegel does say such things as, in the *Philosophy of Right*, that “truth in philosophy means that the conception corresponds to reality” (§21Z), but this is a claim made under an assumption that begins this book, that the concept “*gives itself*” its reality. This is a difficult claim to understand, but it is in line with the general account of speculative truth as “the concept agrees with itself.”

In line with this, there is an even more general sense in which the invocation of negation is relevant. For each conceptual determination invokes a certain understanding of conceptual determinacy at some stage in the logic. (In the logic of being, it is a concept's contrary understood as its "other," what it is related to, distinguished from, as Hegel says, "externally.") But any such understanding of a concept, while it is an understanding of conceptual determinacy, also is not such an understanding, because it does not involve what "a concept (or capacity for conceptual determination) *really* is," something available to the *Logic* only at its end.

Negation and Contradiction

Everything is inherently contradictory. (*Alle Dinge sind an sich selbst widersprechend.*) (SL II. 287)

Contradiction is the root of all movement [*Bewegung*] and vitality [*Lebendigkeit*]; it is only in so far as something has a contradiction within it that it moves, has an urge [*Trieb*] and activity [*Tätigkeit*].
(Ibid.)

The determination just discussed produces this negative consequence because finitude is conceived by abstract contrast with its contrary, the non-finite or infinity, under the assumption that it is *by being finitude*, just *that* concept, marked off as such, that it excludes or opposes what is nonfinite, the infinite. But, or so we are supposed to acknowledge, this negative determination is essential to the determinacy necessary to set apart and delimit finitude *in the first place*. (There would be nothing to negate otherwise, and if there were, the negation would be, in Hegel's terms, "external," not constitutive of the thing's determinacy.)²⁰ So in a general sense, one has to say that a thing, in this case a basic concept or category, "includes" its contrary, or more precisely its relation to its contrary, in order to be, and be known

20. Putting the matter this way suggests an old criticism of Hegel. The most well-known form is probably Trendelenberg's (1843, 12–19). Has he confused predicate negation with matter-of-fact "opposition" among things? It is colliding moving objects, positive and negative poles of a magnet, etc., that "oppose" one another. What could Hegel mean by suggesting, as he does, both that a concept's determinacy must be said to include its negative relation to its contrary, and this because any *Sache* "opposes" what it is not? The criticism (that Hegel confused *Widerspruch* with *Widerstreit*) resurfaced in Patzig (1974) and Taylor (1975, 234). It has been effectively refuted by Wolff (1981; 1986).

to be, what it is. Neither of these “moments” of negation involves contradiction in the Aristotelian sense because “is” and “is not,” while said of the same thing and at the same time, are not meant in the same sense. But Hegel wants for various reasons to call such an analyzed state a “contradiction,” and there is some ground in the use of that term for saying that.²¹ (This is so, even though, if Hegel were more careful about his terminology, contradiction as such would be limited to a “determination of reflection” in the logic of essence. Unresolved “oppositions” in the logic of being involve an unresolved inconsistency between independent self-sufficiency and dependence on contrasts with a thing’s complement.)²² As Michael Wolff points out, in many contexts we are comfortable enough with the so-called “existence” of contradictions. We also say such things as that a man “contradicts” himself, or a claim “is contradicted” by reality, or that there *are* “performative contradictions,” and it is in this broader sense that Hegel calls these results “contradictory.”²³ The more technical, “reflective” sense emerges later in the logic of essence. An attempt to determine a concept’s content under certain assumptions about determinacy succeeds only by contradicting (not being consistently tenable at the same time as) such assumptions, and so the assumptions must be revised. In the simplest sense, personifying the process, what someone intends to say, means to say, can be “contradicted” by what is

21. A common characterization of Hegel’s position is thus quite misleading. It is true to say that a thing’s identity involves “what it is in its very relation to what it is not” (Bowman 2013, 94). But *that* relation is *not being what-it-is-not*, and this in no way implies “contradiction” in a formal-logical sense. Saying anything *other* than simply saying S’s being P “involves” its *not* being non-P *would* be a contradiction. So I don’t see how one could conclude that “finite things and finite determinations generally have their being or identity in an opposed other and thus are (i.e. have their being in) what they are not (i.e. by virtue of their non-being)” (94). A lot of terms in such claims require amplification (“have their being” or “by virtue of their non-being”), but the general claim that determinacy requires negative exclusion has nothing to do with something’s “*being* what it is not.” There is a contradiction if some Leibnizian, say, thinks an entity’s identity can be established wholly by attention to internal, nonrelational properties and then, while holding such a view, appeals to relational properties, even exclusionary relations, to successfully identify the entity.

22. This is different still from the issue in the logic of the Concept. The concept of the concept is one concept among the many concepts there are; it is a particular concept, other than any other. But it is also universally identical with the conceptuality of all other concepts, and in that sense is identical with all other concepts (is what they are). This “difference and at the same time identity” is different from *Anderssein* in the logic of being, and from the reflective determination of contradiction.

23. Wolff 1981, 22–24. Wolff’s general point that an objective contradiction is a “paronym” is worth further treatment than can be given here. See also Wolff 1986, 112ff.

actually said, what he finds he has to or can say.²⁴ Hegel himself adverts to this way of understanding the self-negating development of the *Logic* at the very end, when he is presenting a recollective account of his own method, and he notes that the abstract treatment of its universal moments is due to the “mere opinion” (*Meinen*) or lack of awareness (*Bewußtseinslosigkeit*) of what it is actually treating (12.240).²⁵ It cannot say what it means to say. As R. Bubner puts it, it is the lack of concord between the mode of exposition (*Darstellung*) and what is to be made intelligible (*die Sache*) that accounts for the “processuality of the *Logic*.”²⁶

In fact, associating what Hegel is up to with a fairly ordinary sense of *practical* contradiction is evoked by Hegel at the beginning of the *Logic* when he is trying to explain the radicality of the initial moment of pure indeterminacy and immediacy:

But if no presupposition is to be made, if the beginning is itself to be taken immediately, then the only determination of this beginning is that it is to be the beginning of logic, of thought as such. There is only present [*vorhanden*] the resolve [*Entschluß*], which can also be viewed as arbitrary [*Willkühr*], of considering [*betrachten*] thinking as such. (21.56)²⁷

What one has, in this highly hypothetical sense, “resolved” to do (consider pure thinking as such), when measured by what one has succeeded (or rather not succeeded) in doing, gives us an initial sense of the role of the negative. It is all still somewhat figurative, but it is, I want to suggest, interpretively on the right track.

At a more abstract level, Hegel tries to offer a general account of why this should happen, and that generally has to do with the inseparability of

24. Cf. Bubner 1976. On this general analogy, as Bubner points out, one begins with the “immediacy” of intention; this is negated by the concrete determinacy of what can be said, its mediation; and one can be said actually to come to appreciate what was intended by having appreciated what was not expressed in the saying of it—a return to a mediated immediacy in Hegel’s complex terminology. This is the same general model Hegel uses for the relation between intention and deed in his theory of action. See Pippin 2008.

25. Di Giovanni translates *Meinen* as “presumption.”

26. Bubner 1976, 45. He also formulates the point as the “discrepancy between claim (*Anspruch*) and accomplishment (*Leistung*)” (49).

27. By calling such a beginning “arbitrary” or willed, Hegel is stressing the practical nature of the moment. That one thinks, as a content, “anything at all,” is not a conclusion of an inference, does not need to be seen as resting on a presupposition. It suffices just to embark on such a project, to conceive coherently as the object of thought “anything at all.”

“position” and “negation” in determination.²⁸ This basic and straightforward logical idea of thought’s “opposition” with itself invoked in this way by Hegel is fairly straightforward (as when what we do to specify the content of a concept ends up failing, not so specifying; we have contradicted what we set out to do), but he eventually makes a great deal out of it. The most simple or even trivial version of the idea is just that if, say, nothing living ever died, the notion of anything *living* would be empty. (The content of the concept of something living is such a content only in such an opposition.) If nothing were ever at rest and everything were always moving, the notion of motion could actually get no grip. If there were nothing lamentable, there would be nothing laudable. In his most speculative example: if everything were *just* what it is and nothing else (“no entity without identity”), then the notion of identity itself would have no content. Determinate identity requires *some* sort of self-differentiation to be intelligible as contentful identity. Otherwise, we would not be able to understand the difference (as we must) between “A” and “A = A.” So anything’s determination is at the same time, just thereby, also a determinate exclusion, and only by that exclusion can it determine. And this is true the other way around too. The soul’s not being mortal does not determine anything if it just excludes the ascribability of that predicate, and so says that what the soul *is* is “somewhere else” in logical space, *anywhere* else but in the “mortal space.” By this determination we know that the soul *is* nonmortal or that it is immortal, is something that lives forever. This is the reasoning that led Kant to include under qualitative determination not just predicate negation but something like term or contrary negation, “infinite” judgments in the table of the functions of judgment, or qualitative “limitation” in the table of categories.²⁹

A somewhat broader way of putting the point is the following. I have said that Hegel’s speculative notion of negation is not predicate or sentence negation, an operator applied to a predicate or a sentence, but a self-negation. In these terms, he means to focus attention on *concept negation*, and it is in this sense that we can understand autonomous self-negation. The easiest way to understand this, and it is a reference Hegel will enthusiastically use, is again to think of Kant’s notion of concepts that are inherently antinomial, that is self-negating. He means concepts like the concept of the smallest

28. This is the most logically abstract version of the same point at stake with Kant: the distinguishability yet inseparability of concept (negation) and intuition (position).

29. See the discussion in Redding 2007, 93–101.

material element of a material body, or the concept of the infinite divisibility of a material body, or the concept of a world beginning in time, or of having always existed, or the concept of an uncaused cause, and so forth. Now concepts, understood as rules, have content by being *understood* to have the content they have. To understand a rule is to know how to use it, and in using it, to know one is following it. If we do not understand it this way, we cannot distinguish between mere regularity and rule-*following*. So understanding such a concept, viz., the concept of a smallest particle of matter, is not, as we have been insisting throughout “grasping a content” but understanding what the rule instructs us to think. That is, the concept is always already a “moment” of a discursive activity, a thinking through of its implications. And such a thinking through ends in the concept’s negating itself, as in the unavoidability of concluding that there is always a smaller particle, for example, following Kant’s account in the antinomies, because the thinking of a smallest particle requires us, instructs us, to think of continuing divisibility. In this sense, the concept negates itself; such negation is autonomous, that is, autonomous to the concept itself, not negated by some other concept or consideration. And just like Hegel, Kant insists on an internal negation of that negation, both for concepts and the negative of those concepts that cannot both be true together but can both be false together (“contraries” in the Aristotelian square), and for those that can both be true together but cannot both be false (“subcontraries”). Hegel does not agree with the way Kant wants to effect this negation of negation, by introducing equivocation between phenomena and noumena, but the logical structure of speculative negation can be understood to follow this route: concept negation as autonomous self-negation, and negation of that negation so as to produce a concept under which can be understood the sublation of both the concept and its negation.³⁰

It is in various ways by ignoring a dependence on contraries and exclusion and attending to concepts in isolation that all the basic concepts under consideration in the *Logic* (until the logic of the Concept itself) are shown to be antinomial in this sense, that the resolve to determine content in such

30. See Hegel’s remarks in the *Philosophy of Nature*, §247:

If we ask whether or not the world has a beginning in time, it is impossible that we should receive a plain and straightforward answer to the question. It is assumed that a plain answer would assure us of one or the other of these alternatives, but the plain answer is that the either-or assumed by the question is unwarranted.

isolation does not match the achievement, that the exposition fails to capture *die Sache*. Obviously what we need to see, though, is how Hegel proposes to show us the relationship between any internal “self-relation” (*Selbstbeziehung*) and what it determinately is not, and why, under what assumptions, this becomes a problem in identifying determinately any of the concepts under investigation.

This is all by way of introduction. The point of view is too high-altitude to get us very far. For example, without further elaboration of the point made above about determinate negation, it still seems that the basic model for the negation at issue is predicate or sentence negation, as if the determination in question is the assertion “The finite is not the infinite” or “It is not the case that the finite is the infinite.” As we shall see, this can be quite misleading.³¹ In addition, one tends to focus first on the first examples one comes across in the logic of being, and that can be misleading too.³²

The issue of negation has a great deal of continuity, but it also changes in the logic of essence and the logic of the Concept. In keeping with his own association between general and transcendental logic, the considerations discussed so far should not be understood to be matters of formal clarity in a reflection on judgmental logic, as if confined to a clarification of the rules for “making sense of all sense-making.” As Hegel insisted, we are not studying how we think about (or talk about) matters (or even how *we* “must” think). The question is a question about “*any* possible intelligibility,” and so about *being in its intelligibility*, or as he puts it, *die Sache, that* issue, not “our ways” of rendering intelligible.

Or, to cite a briefer, clearer example of what Hegel considers too “abstract” a distinction between logical form and content, contradiction is supposed to be explicable “merely formally,” as a matter of general

31. There is a general sense in which the opening exposition can be taken as a model for what follows, but it needs to be formulated at a very high level of abstraction: the unsustainability of fixed and independent content, as Wolff (2013) notes.

32. It is true, as Pinkard (1988, 26) points out, that Hegel does say the beginning is “the ground of the whole science” (21.56) and even more strongly:

Thus the beginning of philosophy is the ever present and self-preserving foundation of all subsequent developments, remaining everywhere immanent in its further determinations. (21.58)

But this can mean: what follows *from beginning with the acknowledgment that no beginning with mere being is possible*, and the recognition that any such beginning must be “determinate being” (*Dasein*). That thesis about the role of determinacy is what “remains everywhere immanent.”

I take Hegel to be saying that at 21.102–3. This issue will be discussed in chapter 6.

logic, as Kant understands that domain. In Kant's various explanations, it comes down to $\sim(p \ \& \ \sim p)$. Or, to state it in its predicative form, $\sim((S \text{ is } P) \ \& \ (S \text{ is } \sim P))$. But to revert to our discussion above (and this is the source of one of Hegel's most enthusiastic compliments to Kant), Kant himself showed in the mathematical antinomies that what looks formally to be (what, in fact, *formally* is) a contradiction, p and $\sim p$, *need not be*, not if we understand properly the connection between "the concept" and "the matter itself."³³ Again, if the sentences are "The world has a beginning in time" and "The world does not have a beginning in time," then it is not the case that if one is true, its negation must be false, and vice versa. They can be, as in this case, contraries, not contradictories. They can *both* be false, as in Kant's own examples to explain his position on the antinomies. In his examples, if the subject is what he calls the *Weltall*, the world-totality, then the disjunction "The world-totality moves" or the "The world-totality does not move" amounts to a statement of contraries and the law of the excluded middle does not apply, as in, even more simply, "The stone smells good" and "The stone does not smell good."³⁴ Stones don't have odor; both judgments are false.³⁵

But what would a nonformal conception of negation, one not restricted to the function of a logical constant, one that has some real philosophical work to do, amount to?

Negation as Material Incompatibility: Robert Brandom

Robert Brandom calls Hegel's concept of determinate negation "Hegel's most fundamental conceptual tool," and he means throughout Hegel's *Logic*, semantics and metaphysics. He defines such negation in terms of "material incompatibility,"³⁶ and in a way deeply in tune with Hegel's project, he insists that the general normativity of material inferences is irreducible to the normativity of formal principles alone (as in the point made in the example of "contradiction" just discussed in the previous section). It was suggested above that the most important of Hegel's many uses of negation was the contrastive relation with what it is not, in the logic of being (and only under those assumptions) with its contraries or in the "dialectic" between

33. As Brandom (2012, 17) puts it, expressed just in the formal mode, the notion "fails to capture more than an abstract shadow of the important phenomenon."

34. CPR A503/B531; Wolff 1984, 193ff.

35. Wolff 1979, 341–42; 1981, 13ff.

36. Brandom 2002, 180.

self-sufficient determinacy and dependent determinacy. (Hegel remarks in his *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* that negativity is to be understood “not as change, nor yet as nullity, but as difference of determination.”)³⁷ Brandom has given us a rich account of what that claim amounts to. But it is a limited one, and seeing those limitations will, I hope, illuminate something about Hegel’s full position. (This limitation is partly due to Brandom’s relying so much on the *PhG*, and it will help reveal something about the status of negation in the *Logic*.)³⁸

Brandom’s central idea is that determinate negation is a modal issue, a matter of alethic modalities, concerned with material modalities in reality (a modal realism) of necessity, possibility, and impossibility. By “modal” Brandom means to point to the fact that theoretical cognition of the world, even empirical description, relies on words that are not mere descriptions, like laws that support robust counterfactual inferences, necessitation, preclusion, and that our descriptions, quoting Sellars, are only descriptions (and not “labels”) “in the space of implications.”³⁹ Or:

For there to be some determinate way the world is just is for it to be articulated into states of affairs — objects possessing properties and standing in relations — that include and exclude each other in modally robust ways.⁴⁰

The most manageable unit of intelligibility is the judgment, understood by Brandom as, *au fond*, a *commitment*. (He says judgments are “the smallest unit for which one can take cognitive responsibility.”)⁴¹ (He also says that his use of “commitment” tracks Hegel on “setzen.”)⁴² (Brandom’s full theory

37. *GW* 8: 30.

38. See Martin (2012, 40), on the limitation to material incompatibility

39. Brandom 2012, 6–7. The Sellars quotation is from Sellars 1958, 306–7. The implication for Brandom is that we can, we must, be able to say such things as that it “is objectively *necessary* that pure copper melt at 1084° C, and *impossible* for a mass to be accelerated without being subjected to some force,” and once we understand this, we understand the “objective world as already in conceptual shape, and hence graspable as such.” This avoids the cardinal sin of modern philosophy for Hegel (for Brandom): understanding our representations as in such conceptual shape, but not the represented. Therewith the path to skepticism. Brandom 2012, 8. By contrast Sellars (and Hegel) would insist that describing and understanding (reliance on such modality) go hand in hand, are inseparable.

40. Brandom 2012, 9.

41. Brandom 2011, II, 5.

42. Brandom 2011, II, 1. This leads to the question of whether Fichte’s use of *setzen* can accommodate this interpretation of it as normative commitment, or “saying how the *nicht-Ich* is,” rather than, as in many interpretations, being responsible for how it is. That and how it *can* so accommodate are suggested in Pippin 2000.

of intentionality is that it is functionalist, inferentialist, holist, normatively regulated, and socially pragmatist—far too much to consider here.)⁴³ One important element in understanding the possible content of such a commitment is an understanding of conceptual content, the very problem we have been tracking in Hegel. And the most important element in the possibility of such content is that any entitled wielder of such a concept is just thereby (by having understood the content, come to possess the concept) extruding material incompatibilities and finding and endorsing (“extracting,” he sometimes says) further material commitments.

According to this conception, to be conceptually contentful is to stand in relations of material incompatibility (“determinate negation”) and material consequence (“mediation”) to other such contentful items.⁴⁴ These incompatibilities are not modeled on predicate negation. Something’s being a square excludes its being an aspiration or an episode in the Civil War, but these are “indeterminate negations” and locate the subject in that infinite logical space not “filled” (in the early Wittgenstein’s model) with what is excluded, just somewhere else. (This is what traditional logic called an “infinite” judgment.) But that a square is not a circle (that its being a square “excludes” the possibility of its being a nonsquare), or that something cannot be red and green all over, or that Pittsburgh’s being west of Harrisburg and Harrisburg’s being west of Philadelphia means that Pittsburgh is west of Philadelphia, are all determinately informative, and the inferences are not formal-logical. (Red and square are different but compatible properties; square and circle are different but incompatible; two different kinds of differences.) These material incompatibilities and material consequences are normative requirements for understanding the content’s being the content it is. They have to do with the coherent thinking of these contents, but they involve no reference to the psychology of thinking. In a Fregean mode, one could say, as Brandom does, that *thoughts* stand in these relations, not psychological thinking events. Having noted that, when all goes well, what we know is what is the case, Brandom also notes that Hegel wants to understand what we should say about cases when all does not go well, or when we

43. See the discussion in Pippin 2006.

44. Brandom 2011, II, 2. This means there is a *priority* to these material relations over logical-formal formulations. According to Brandom (2012), “the point of introducing specifically logical vocabulary” is “to codify antecedent properties of inference that articulate the conceptual content of non-logical expressions” (16). He is aware of course that arguing that all of this can be ascribed to Frege is controversial, that there is another Frege in the commentaries, the more representationalist or “later” Frege.

do not yet know how things are going. That is, in the *Phenomenology*, where the question is “how it is for the subject” when things are unsettled or error occurs, Hegel wants to discuss the relation between how things seem to be, or appearances, and how they are really (or between representings and the represented), and Brandom shows how Hegel can have a position on this that does not rely on Kant’s “confirmation” by extraconceptual intuitions. (He works out, in ways germane to the *PhG* but not in this context, how things can be said to be for-consciousness and to-consciousness.) As we shall see, the *Logic*’s notion of *Schein* is quite different, and raises some questions about the scope of Brandom’s approach.

But this all concerns not just thinking; *facts* or states of affairs stand to each other in these relations as well. The “logical” relations simply reflect the way *the world is conceptually structured*.⁴⁵ (Another manifestation of the Hegelian understanding of the relation between logic and metaphysics.) So on the object side, we have alethic modal relations, and on the subjective side, we have deontic normative relations: what we ought to extrude, and what we ought to undertake. They are both “two sides of one coin.” More precisely formulated:

First, deontic normative vocabulary is a *pragmatic metavocabulary* for alethic modal vocabulary. Second, as a consequence, there is a kind of *sense-dependence* relation between these vocabularies.⁴⁶

(The second formulation is something we saw and discussed in the second chapter.)

Now this sort of conceptual or modal realism is only one of a triplicity of general characterizations that Brandom thinks we have to understand together if we are to understand Hegel. I cannot go into them all and will concentrate on this modal realism, but the rest of the picture should be noted. There is first *objective idealism*, defined as “a symmetric sense dependence of the concepts articulating subjective processes of concept use and concepts articulating objective conceptual relations.” The modally real impossibilities and implications would still exist even if there were no subjects around, but the sense or meaning of these determinations depends on our way of identifying them, as the determinate meaning of a fact could be said to depend on the meaning of the content of an assertion, a particular on the behavior of

45. See Brandom 2011, I, 16–17.

46. Brandom 2011, II, 16.

singular terms, and so forth. And finally there is “*conceptual idealism*,” where Brandom’s pragmatic reading of Hegel begins to be more detectable.

This aspect arises with the question,

should this whole constellation of objective conceptual relations (the holistic structure we saw atomistically conceived sequentially as objects-and-properties, facts, and laws) and subjective conceptual practices and processes be understood in terms of the relational categories of objectivity or the practical-processual categories of subjectivity?⁴⁷

The answer is the latter. These practical-purposive processes, the “instituting” processes of purposive action and intentional agency, have the priority raised as a question in what was just quoted. (This aspect of Brandom’s position is quite complicated, since it involves his reading of Hegel’s summative position in the *Science of Logic*, in which the Absolute Idea is the unity of the practical and theoretical idea. Since we lack a full discussion by Brandom of the *Logic*, I will rely later on Brandom’s article about logical and empirical concepts, which is too limited to permit us to broach the issue of the Absolute and Brandom’s reading of that issue.)

The way in which Brandom discusses the deontic normative relations side touches on the issue raised earlier about the mysterious talk of resolve and drive in the *SL*. A very attractive feature of Brandom’s approach is that this aspect is built into the theory of conceptual content itself. (Again, as throughout, we must think of these activities not as psychological events but as expressing the normative proprieties inherent in commitments as such.) He claims that Hegel is building on an idea of Kant’s:

The responsibility in question should be understood as a kind of *task* responsibility: it is the responsibility to *do* something. What one is responsible for doing in committing oneself to *p* is *integrating* that new commitment into the constellation of prior commitments, so as to sustain its exhibition of the kind of unity distinctive of apperception.⁴⁸

The concept of *negation* (incompatibility) in terms of which we should understand determinateness (whether of subjective thought or of objective fact) essentially involves a principle of *motion*, of *change*, of active, practical *doing*—as odd as this seems from the point of view of the logical tradition

47. Brandom 2011, II, 7.

48. Brandom 2011, II, 5.

indigenous to *Verstand*.⁴⁹ (This is the beginning of a much longer topic, to be discussed at length in chapter 7.)

Brandom is basing his account on the introduction to the *Phenomenology*, but as his formulations indicate, he is proposing a general theory of Hegelian conceptual content on its basis.⁵⁰ I noted in the previous chapter that this pragmatic gloss on apperception construes it as a subject's reflective relation to the status of one's own judgments, and that this is indeed an implication of Kant's claim about the apperceptive character of consciousness and judgment, but it is a derivative one. A judgment qua judgment is, in the first place, "open" to such reflection because it is apperceptively affirmed, and this possibility (its "negative self-relation") must be understood before what it makes possible—reflective integration in a network of commitments—is introduced. And in the *Logic*, speaking casually, something goes wrong at the outset in our attempt to follow through on what is introduced—the way we go about such discharging of commitments. We have no sense yet of any important limitation in the way "what we are supposed to do" in carrying out this commitment, if regulated by the assumptions of *Verstand*, should necessarily produce "thought's opposition to itself." Extruding incompatibilities is what one is obligated to do "whenever they arise." We have no sense yet that, under certain inadequate presuppositions about how to do this, (i) *they cannot but arise* (and not merely as a vague result of our finitude)⁵¹ and (ii) we will end up intending to do something (extruding incompatibilities, say) *that we will not initially, from within the conceptual point of view in question, know how to do*. The "doing" that Brandom introduces also introduces the kind of practical contradiction we made room for above, but it does not yet connect with the more determinate account of the limitations in ways of rendering intelligible that Hegel is interested in in the *SL*.⁵²

49. Brandom 2011, II, 18.

50. There are several book-length issues involved in the much-debated issue of the relation between the *Phenomenology* and the *Logic*. It is perhaps the most discussed issue in the history of Hegel scholarship. The *Logic* is not resting on the "experience" of incompatibilities and the task of resolving/avoiding them, but there is certainly an analogy in an attempted determination of content that generates an inconsistency that must be resolved. That analogy is Brandom's opening. But the "metaconceptual" level is not just a matter of higher-order abstraction, and so the ground of the inevitable incompatibilities and their inevitability is a different matter. This is the main limitation of Brandom's approach for the *Logic*, as I will try to show in what follows.

51. And so, because of this finitude, the fact that we are all, philosophically speaking, "sinners," incompatibilities are "inevitable," as at Brandom (2012, 17).

52. Cf. Wolff 1986, where he characterizes Aristotle in *Metaphysics*, chapters 3 and 4, as treating contradiction as a *Handeln*, an action, a result of what someone does in saying something,

I have already argued that as long as we are clear that we are using notions like thinking, accepting, rejecting, extruding (incompatibilities), and extracting (commitments) not psychologically but as expressive of the normative requirements constitutive of conceptual content as such, we should accept the *Logic*'s own account of "movement," "resolve," and therewith "contradiction" in very much the spirit, at least, of Brandom's enterprise. (Again, more on this in chapter 7.) His functionalist account of content spares us the prospect of a moving or self-transforming kind of (very strange) abstract object, the concept. Brandom thinks he has given us the resources to account for the "meta-conceptual categorical framework" of *Vernunft*, at the speculative level, as opposed to *Verstand*, and a key element of this claim is the understanding of negation, and so the concomitant commitment to this practical doing at the *Vernunft* level.

But cleaning up potential inconsistencies in the network of one's commitments is quite a *Verstand*-like thing to do, and *Verstand*, anthropomorphizing a bit, is happy enough with activities or movements like inferring, concluding, presupposing.⁵³ It is not as if *Verstand* just judges and *Vernunft* infers. As noted, the problem is that *Verstand*, at a level of metaconceptual, speculative abstraction, cannot do what must be done; let us say, for example, it contrasts the finite with the infinite (with, determinately, what it is not), or the one and the many, in a way that undermines the very contrast itself and so requires a "negation" of *that* notion of negation. And given the context of the *Logic*, the inevitability of contradiction cannot rest, as it does for Brandom, on "the conceptual inexhaustibility of sensuous immediacy."⁵⁴

In general, Brandom's approach has the advantage of giving us a coherent way of understanding the position, clearly Hegel's, that negation should not be understood as a mere logical operator. The *world* is "full of negation";

in this case an "empty activity" (112). This issue is given a thorough and compelling treatment in Kimhi.

53. So I disagree with Brandom 2012: "For it is to move from the order of semantic and ontological explanation that takes *judgment*, the understanding, as primary, to embrace the metaconception that takes *inference*, reason as primary. In Hegel's adaptation of Kant's terminology, that is to move from the framework of *Verstand* to that of *Vernunft*" (9). For Hegel, the Kantian notion of inference, especially the way the notions of "conditioned" and "unconditioned" are deployed in it, is, while called the activity of *Vernunft* by Kant, paradigmatically the mode of thinking of *Verstand* as Hegel understands it. The difference turns on, for Hegel, the assumptions about the relation between form and content, and the meaning of the (admittedly opaque) phrase that, in speculation alone, the concept is understood such as to give itself its own content.

54. Brandom 2012, 18.

that is, in Brandom's interpretation (and in his own view), objects and events stand in modally robust relations of exclusion and implication, all such that understanding the world imposes deontic normative requirements on anyone asserting anything about it. The limitations of the approach (or the reason for its merely introductory status), which Brandom admits, is that the position is oriented from "ground level" cases of, largely, matters of fact known empirically. There is nothing necessarily misleading about this. Hegel does the same thing, trying to exemplify points he is making about reality and negation, or something and other, or finite and infinite, by talking about meadows and ponds, the moon and the sun, "the logical significance of what people call 'character'" (EL §90Z), and so forth. But there is a problem if we orient ourselves exclusively from this understanding when we move to the metaconceptual, speculative level. In Hegel's case, those exemplifications just cited express a specific understanding of determinacy, largely what he calls qualitative determinacy, an understanding that persists throughout the explanation of quantitative and "measured" determinacy, that is, throughout the logic of being. So in the first place, this is a *limited* kind of negation (typical of the logic of being, what Hegel calls *Anderssein*), not all of what Hegel means by "the reality of negation" in its most general sense in the *Logic*. It is not what is at stake in the assumptions of a reflective approach to reality, one that seeks to fix essential identities (not just matter-of-fact determinacy, specified qualitatively), identities not available to observation and description, and to understand the uniquely negative relation between essence and appearance. Still less is it—this opposition between a thing and its contraries—suitable for the determination of an act as good, or of a house as good, or of "what goodness is" (or of what is "fully" or "really" a good act or a true house), and that opposition alone does not get us to the complicated status of negation in the unfolding of a logic of the Concept.

Partly this is a problem for Brandom because he has (so far) provided only a kind of one-size-fits-all account of determinate negation. This certainly does get at something quite important in Hegel, even though, as P. Redding has argued, it is more important to Hegel than to Brandom that material incompatibilities are to be understood in an "Aristotelian" way, that is, in terms of term logic.⁵⁵ In this picture, individuals are always

55. Redding 2007, 79–84. (With the qualification noted earlier about his understanding of the elements of such a logic.)

understood as instances of kinds, this-suches, and by virtue of that, are determinately excluded from their “complements” or contraries and just thereby determined. Horses are mammals, *and so not nonmammals*, that is, not birds, or reptiles, or amphibians, and so forth. They are the contraries of mammals, not just in the infinite logical space of all that is not mammalian, set by a negated predicate. (To make Brandom’s main point, it is important to say: they do not just *also happen to lack* the properties of birds, etc. By being mammals they *cannot* have the properties of birds, reptiles, etc.)⁵⁶ Individuals are not arguments satisfying functions, but members of determinate kinds and intelligible by virtue of that and by virtue of what that determines by “negating,” excluding as impossible. What is important in the context of this discussion is not whether a more Fregean approach can handle such reliance on terms in its own way (which Brandom argues),⁵⁷ but that a great deal changes when Hegel begins to consider indi-

56. It is important to say it this way, for one reason: to distinguish the claim from Kant’s, in his account of “The Principle of Thoroughgoing Determination,” for whom the exclusion of such a negated predicate is such a lack. Here is a piece of Kantian prose that rivals Hegel’s. “A transcendental negation, on the contrary, signifies non-being in itself, and is opposed to transcendental affirmation, which is a Something, the concept of which in itself already expresses a being, and hence it is called reality (thinghood), because through it alone, and only so far as it reaches, are objects Somethings (things); the opposed negation, on the contrary, signifies a mere lack, and where this alone is thought, the removal of everything is represented” (A575/B603). Franks (2005) has suggested that when Kant goes on from this principle to arrive at the concept of an *ens realissimum* (in a move from “the totality of possibilities” to “all actualized possibilities” that I find bewildering), he sets up the possibility of using the concept of such a “maximal reality” (all of whose possibilities have been actualized) to derive the transcendently real properties of finite things *by limitation* of such a reality, thus allowing an answer to critics of the Metaphysical Deduction (72–78). This would in turn show us how the “resurfacing of Kant’s pre-critical understanding of God” could be understood as the “source for the Derivation Monism of the German idealists” (79). Beside the fact that Kant’s own derivation of the *ens realissimum* from the concept of all possibilities is deeply obscure, and the fact that Kant is talking about what he regards as aspects of the Transcendental Dialectic (and so impossible), the prospect that Franks opens up as the task of the idealists would be hopeless, for good Kantian reasons. Here the Kantians would be right: it is unfulfillable promise. Moreover, this is the notion of negation of mere limitation that Hegel is objecting to as a limitation of *Verstand*, and I cannot find evidence for the strategy Franks suggests.

57. “Material incompatibilities and consequences can be considered either for predicates (properties) or for sentences (states of affairs). The difference of logical categorial focus is orthogonal to the distinction between material incompatibility and formal inconsistency. So I do not see that the centrality of the concept of *determinate negation* to Hegel’s enterprise gives us any reason to think that Hegel’s meaning will be ‘masked’ if we don’t follow him in setting his claims in the framework of a term logic.” Brandom 2012, 14.

viduals not as intelligible by virtue of kinds, but as appearances, the “ground” of which is unobserved, and ultimately relies for a proper account-giving of this ground relation on the notion of law. As Redding has also claimed, the character of determinate negation depends a good deal more on these very different contexts (the three “logics”) than Brandom’s modal realism can handle in Hegel.⁵⁸

Secondly, the move from the ordinary to the speculative level—the metaconceptual structure of reason—alters the epistemology of negation understood as Brandom does. At the “ground level,” there is no serious epistemological problem involved in the determination of the content of “modally rich” descriptions of the world. It is a necessary element in understanding surface and red that a surface that is red all over excludes being green all over. And if a commitment to a claim happens to be incompatible with another commitment, then the question of how to resolve it is not epistemologically problematic. One has to give up either one or the other, resting on the best evidence or argument available, or successfully recategorize the concepts such that the contradiction disappears in a non-question-begging way. But at the metaconceptual level, the epistemology has to be quite different. Concepts like being, or becoming, or something, or manyness, or continuity, or infinity cannot of course be empirically based and must rather be understood in some progression of interdefinability. And that alters any possible understanding of the *origin* of the discovered incompatibilities. These cannot be due to our inability, as finite thinkers, to correctly anticipate all of the deontic requirements of any one commitment. Hegel is clearly trying to show that under some limited assumptions about the nature of determinacies, incompatibilities (and incompatibilities of a certain sort) are unavoidable and not a contingent matter of fact. The possibilities of resolution do not therefore involve assumptions like: “One or the other commitment must be in error. Which

58. Redding also notes that Hegel would want to leave room for concepts, like beauty, the content of which does not, cannot, depend on the inferential roles it plays. As understood after Kant, the notion cannot function as a normal predicate, even in such a conceptual role theory, without negating the free play inherent in the notion. Redding 2012, 4–5. Interestingly, Hegel himself, in his *Lectures on Fine Art*, never makes such a point about beauty, although the fact that he insists that the appreciation of the beautiful is a sensible-affective modality of understanding the Absolute (not a conceptual modality) might be taken to imply such a claim. See my discussion in Pippin 2013a.

one should I give up?" Speculative negation of negation (aka "*Aufhebung*") does not work that way. Said in its full Hegelian language, at the speculative level, the development of the concept is autonomous (not driven by the discovery of unexpected inconsistencies) and, much more importantly, *self-negating*.⁵⁹ In Brandom's account, however valuable it is, we do not

59. The unusual character of this requirement has led some, like Henrich and Bowman, to argue that true Hegelian negation, the engine of the *Logic*'s movement and its systematic structure, is "*absolute negation*." This means, not an equiprimordially between affirmation and negation, but the absolute logical priority of negation, with affirmation a consequence. There is then an attempt to show that Hegel tries to understand the basic "determinations of reflection," like identity and difference, in terms of such a logical structure, and therewith to show that the entire structure of the *Logic* is based on such a concept of negation. I am defending, in the terms that Bowman borrows from Horn's *Natural History of Negation*, Hegel as a proponent of the former, a "symmetricalist," and have focused on the implications of an apperceptive account of judgment as the key to understanding the intertwined positive and negative aspects of a judgment. A "negative asymmetricalist" must proceed by assuming that such negation, if absolutely prior, and yet the negation of something, can negate only *itself*, with affirmation the product of a negation of negation (something like "The negative's self-negation"). See Bowman 2013, 239–59, especially 249, 256. I cannot see that we have, by either Henrich or Bowman, a worked-out demonstration of such a notion of absolute negation as the underlying notion appealed to by Hegel *throughout*, or how it is to be understood in terms of the different statuses of negation in the three "logics." (This, although Bowman's account is considerably more developed and more plausible than Henrich's.) This is so, I think, even though the basic intuition underlying their formulation is correct: the *Logic* is supposed to be "pure thinking thinking thinking," that is, autonomous and self-sustaining. This means that negation cannot be the negation of something *external to thought*, an operation on an extraconceptual content. It must be thought's self-negating, and then the negation of that negation. So Henrich (1976) is right to call this the *Grundoperation* of the *Logic*. I think that when we attend to Hegel's appeals to "absolute negativity," though, it is clear that he applies the notion in a variety of ways, none of which looks strictly like Henrich's formulation. After the first, unique self-defeating moment of Being-Nothing (where *being* is self-negating), it surfaces with regard to the category of "something" in the logic of being, and that "negation of negation" is a negation of the negation of qualitatively determinate reality (that is, of a *Denkbestimmung*, but of something *positive*) (21.103) and does not fit Henrich's model. When the phrase is used to describe the "I's" status, the equiprimordially of self-positing and self-negating is clear (21.224). And when it emerges in a more recognizable Henrichian context, in the logic of essence, Hegel is trying to explain that the inessential manifestations of some thing have to be understood in some way as a *thing's essence showing itself as nonessential*, mere *Schein* (11.248), a kind of "self-repelling" self-negation. The manifestation of what-essence-is-not is essence's *own* manifestation, and so that negation of essence is itself a candidate for negation (since it is an essence's self-negating). These are obscure notions, but I detect no "negation of *pure* negation itself" version of what Bowman calls "absolute negativity." In this respect, I agree with the criticisms of Henrich's position on absolute negation in Tugendhat (1970, 150) and Theunissen (1980, 151).

Moreover, this whole account is as abstract as Hegel's and leaves the reader somewhat dissatisfied, since the initial move simply presumes that a self-sufficient logical system requires an

have yet a sufficient explanation of the idea of *logical* “movement” (especially given that it is not driven in the *SL* by “consciousness’s” *experience* of incompatible commitments), or the appropriate logical understanding of this notion of “self-negation,” a notion most on view, as we shall see, in the logic of essence. So, for example, Hegel says, in the preface to the second edition of the *Encyclopedia Logic*:

With the absolute right of the freedom proper to it, this thinking stubbornly insists on reconciling itself with the sound content, but only insofar as this content has been able to give itself the form [Gestalt] most worthy of it: that of the concept and of necessity, which binds everything, content as well as thought, and precisely therein makes it free. (EL 20–21)

Accordingly, Brandom is right to claim something like this:

From Hegel’s point of view, that extrusion or expulsion of incompatible commitments and extraction of and expansion according to consequential commitments is the inhalation and exhalation, the breathing rhythm by which a rational subject lives and develops.⁶⁰

But as stated, the claim is too restrictive. It ought to read “is a crucial element of the inhalation and exhalation, the breathing rhythm, etc.” There are two more “logics” to go.

So while Brandom’s account of modal realism is a compelling picture of what Hegel calls *Anderssein* and is appropriate for the logic of being and the consciousness chapters of the *PhG*, commitment to it will not allow the

autonomous starting point, and negation then simply enters onstage as the most likely, or even only, candidate. (Not to mention that the notion of an absolutely autonomous starting point is un-Hegelian and impossible.) In itself, such a notion is unmotivated and has the feel, in Henrich, of a thought experiment. Imagine a logical system that begins with only one logical operator: negation. Then what? It is possible to see that the general structure Henrich is trying to clarify corresponds in a number of ways with important moments of Hegel’s account. What counts as finite in Hegel’s treatment is the nonsubstantial, not substance, *not wahrhaftes Sein*, and so has an inherently negative status. But in being shown to be the result of the self-determination of substance, that negativity is negated. Or the converse is. Substance understood as infinite totality is an indeterminate blank; its status is negative. But finding a way of linking determinate, finite being to such a self-determining substance negates that indeterminate emptiness. The “negation of negation” turns up everywhere in these accounts. See also the valuable account by Martin 2012, 49–64.

60. Brandom 2012, I, 15.

proper understanding of the relation between the categories of the *Logic* to one another and will lead one into a limited reading of the *Phenomenology*.

This allows a repetition and intensification of a claim about Brandom's approach I made earlier. If we distinguish making the world explicit, rendering it intelligible, from making explicit these forms of making the world explicit, rendering intelligible ways of rendering intelligible, then the former depends on the latter, the latter constitutes the possibility of the former, not, as the Brandom passage just cited and others seem to suggest, the other way around, as if the task is clarifying what we have already done. (I mean: as if the development of logical concepts is somehow essentially postempirical, retrospectively trying to get clear what ways of mediating the immediate have become required, required by new empirical discoveries.)

This latter sounds like what Brandom means when he says,

In exercising a capacity, engendered by the use of his logical vocabulary, to say and think explicitly what one has all along implicitly been doing in saying and thinking anything at all—namely, determining content, incorporating immediacy in the form of mediation, by engaging in a process of concept-revision through experience—this is the sort of self-consciousness Hegel calls “Absolute Knowledge.”⁶¹

And when he says,

For the process recollected in the case of the logical concepts is not (in either of its versions) one of determination by incorporation of immediacy, as it is in the case of empirical concepts. In the logical case the transformative *Erfahrung* that is rehearsed in the two books is rather motivated wholly by considerations that show up retrospectively as having always already been implicit in the contents of the (meta)concepts already in play.⁶²

What could it mean to say that Hegel develops these metaconceptual resources “out of the raw materials he inherited from the philosophical tradition”? There is no such reliance in the *Logic*, and the development in question is modeled, as we have been saying, on Kant's *Metaphysical Deduction*: thought's a priori and “productive” determination of its own possibility.

61. Brandom 2005, 156.

62. Brandom, 2005, 158.

There are other passages in Brandom's corpus like the ones just quoted, and they introduce another interesting wrinkle in his position. For example:

The *Wiederholung* presented in the *Logic* is substantially more retrospectively reconstructed, and hence more rational in the sense of more reason revealing, than is that of the *Phenomenology*. But for both, Hegel clearly believes that the only way to come to occupy the cognitive position he finally arrives at is by going through the conceptual process and progress to which the long expositions of those works are guides. It is no use jumping ahead to peek at the ending and see how the books come out.⁶³

Exactly so, one wants to say, but this appears to be how Brandom thinks Hegel thinks of his own position, in contrast to how Brandom thinks of it. For he also writes, in contrast with this "no peeking" passage,

For we can start with a *pragmatic* metalanguage, in which we describe the practices that confer and determine conceptual content, and specify in those terms what it is that a particular logical locution makes explicit, introducing it as expressing *those* features. This is, not by coincidence, the path I pursue in *Making It Explicit*. I think it is possible in principle to say how we should think about discursive practice *according to the conceptual scheme in place at the end of the Phenomenology and the Science of Logic, without having to rehearse the expository paths by which Hegel develops that scheme for us*.⁶⁴

I am suggesting that how Hegel thinks of his own position is how we should think of it. Without such a picture, incompatible commitments generated at the empirical level will look like the engine driving the whole pulsating self-negating process, and the status of the *Logic* and logical movement will look confusing.

Finally, there is one other attempt to differentiate Hegel's treatment of negation from a formal treatment of the logical operator, to understand the reality of negation and so the reality of dialectic, and we should review that briefly before moving on to examples at work in the logic of being.

63. Brandom 2005, 157.

64. Brandom 2005, 160.

Real Opposition

We are investigating the forms of negation Hegel claims to be assumed in the possibility of determinate intelligibility in different contexts, under different assumptions about determinacy. This is just a first pass at familiarizing ourselves with the topic. It will recur in different forms constantly throughout. Summarized very crudely, these “kinds” of determinacy are expressed in assertions like, first, “Socrates is white,” or “Rosie is a dog,” or “Copper is an electricity conductor”; second, in assertions like “Such a plant is curative,” “That punishment is effective,” or “Wolves hunt in packs”; and third, in what Hegel takes to be proper “judgments,” like “That is a good house,” or “That is bad for horses,” or “That action is good.” (These distinctions assume the most important general claim made in the *Logic*, a claim that has already surfaced often. It is the claim about the “logical differences”—that is, the differences between the different modalities of judgment, different forms of thought—between the intelligibility of atomic particulars in their qualitative and quantitative distinctness, particulars as appearances of essence, and particulars judged “according to their concept.”)⁶⁵

Various higher-order concepts are said by Hegel to be presupposed in such possible determinations, ranging from “finitude” to “essence” and “law,” to “universality,” “life,” and even “method.” None of these concepts can be understood to be derived empirically; they are presupposed in any empirical determination (in different ways, in the different contexts), and their content is a matter of both “internal,” self-related “moments” and “external” dependence on relations to contrary or otherwise “negative” “moments.”

The content of a true assertion is what is the case, and so these constitutive moments of any possible intelligible assertion are the “forms of reality.” Any assertable claim (of various sorts) must be an expression of such conceptual specifications of intelligibility, and these intelligibility conditions constitute the possibility of intelligible bearers of truth (judgments). The forms of intelligibility are the forms of what could be true, although they do not settle the question of what, in particular, is true. What we want to know is both something about the material relations of exclusion necessary to differentiate and render contentful these higher-order concepts, and why there should be some inherent problem, some unavoidable inconsistency or

65. Socrates happens to be white, is essentially a man, and can be considered as either a good man or not.

antinomy, under the specific assumptions of each “logic,” in specifying those internal and external relations.

Skepticism about such an approach is easy to understand. If the above is an adequate gloss on the claims we started with in chapter 2 (“being is known to be in itself a pure concept and the pure concept to be true being”), then we seem to be saying that these modally real relations of negation, however many kinds there are, do not depend *for their reality* on negators, excluders, claim makers. What we do in avoiding inconsistencies and what “the world does” in excluding incompatibilities *are two sides of the same coin*. The “status” of such modalities is not wholly confined within *what we do* to differentiate, discriminate, infer. They exist as what Brandom calls “claimables” even if we imagine a world without any claimings.⁶⁶ It could look as if we are close to positing something like negative facts, which some have seen to be required in order to explain the possibility of the intelligibility of the content of false assertions. It might seem that we are drawn into the reality of possible worlds (the world of “what could be claimed” even if there were no claimers) or at least an unjustified projection of the requirements of successful describing/explaining “onto” the world as it is in itself.

But it is completely foreign to Hegel’s approach (and what he thinks he has established in the *Phenomenology*) to entertain speculation and philosophically serious worries about the status of claimable truths even if there is no one around to claim them. That is like yearning for a view of the real world without our having to use our “instruments” to grasp it (thus grasping only what can be grasped by our instruments), or is close to the nearly mad fantasy of trying to know what the world would be like independent of our way of knowing it. Our way of knowing it is *knowing it*, knowing what is the case, or it is not knowledge. What could be known or not yet known does not have to “exist” in some way in order for us to understand how things can be the case without anyone available to claim it is the case. To project from the actual to an imagining of what can be said about what might be the case without anyone available to claim it is simply *to imagine what it would be to claim it*. This is no reason to worry that we are imagining it merely “for us,” by our lights alone, and so forth, not if it is knowledge we are imagining. Fear of error is the cause of error in this case, as Hegel has written in the introduction to the *Phenomenology*.⁶⁷

66. Brandom 2000b, 162.

67. So from Hegel’s point of view, when Rorty (1989) reasons, “Since truth is a property of sentences, since sentences are dependent for their existence on vocabularies, since vocabularies are made by human beings, so are truths” (21), he is equivocating on “truths.” Truths are what is

But there is another way to understand the “reality of negative modalities,” and it too is suggested by Brandom. In a valuable passage from his first Munich lecture on Hegel, Brandom makes the following remark.

For objective properties, and so the facts concerning which objects exhibit which properties, *also* stand in relations of material incompatibility and consequence. Natural science, paradigmatically Newton’s physics, reveals objective properties and facts as standing to one another in *lawful* relations of exclusion and consequence. That two bodies subject to no other forces collide is materially (non-logically, because of laws of nature) incompatible with their accelerations not changing. That the acceleration of a massive object is changed has as a material consequence (lawfully necessitates) that a force has been applied to it. In the first case, the two ways the world could be do not just *contrast* with one another (differ). It is *impossible* — so Newtonian physics, not logic, tells us, hence *physically* impossible — that both should be facts. And in the second case it is physically necessary — a matter of the laws of physics — that *if* a fact of the first kind were to obtain, so *would* a fact of the second kind.⁶⁸

The implication of this passage, and of all of Brandom’s emphases on modal realism, is that our first orientation in trying to understand Hegelian negation should be not the logical operation of predicate or sentence negation, but real opposition, for example, opposed magnitudes. This contravenes the familiar criticism that Hegel has *confused* logical negation with real opposition (on the contrary, he is aware of it and wants to concentrate on the conceptual counterpart of the latter), and it provides a good transition to one of the other (one of the only other) emphases on such material negation, the interpretation of Michael Wolff.⁶⁹ For Wolff also thinks that the controversy

rightly *claimed*, and claims must be *made*. Certainly, truths are *what* claims that are made claim. But the assumption is that the claims *are* true, and, thankfully, just claiming it is so does not make it so. If it is so, the world is the way we claim it is, and what we know when the claim is true is the way the world is. Moreover, Rorty does not want to go so far as to insist that the existence of photons depends on sentences and vocabularies. But that has to mean that it is true that there are photons, full stop, whether anyone is around to claim it or not. And that gives the game away.

68. Brandom 2012, 16.

69. This direction of interpretation also runs counter to the two influential articles Dieter Henrich has published on the topic. Henrich believes that sentence negation, *Aussagenegation*, or rather the substantivization of such negation, is Hegel’s *point d’appui* throughout, and he criticizes the confusions that result in Hegel when he tries to draw metaphysical implications from this consideration. See Henrich (1976; 1978), and Wolff’s (1979, 343) remarks on Henrich, with which I agree.

in the eighteenth century about positive and negative magnitudes, especially as it surfaced in Kant, as well as the emerging clarity about negative numbers, played a far larger role in the development of Hegel's thinking about negation and contradiction than did a reflection on the logic of the formal operator. In consonance with Brandom's sentiment above, Wolff notes that even Hegel's category of becoming, so important at the beginning of the logic of being, owes much to Hegel's defense of Newton and the latter's doctrine of the becoming equal of magnitudes (*fieri aequales*).⁷⁰

Wolff's main concern in his major book on the subject is with the status of contradiction in Hegel's dialectical logic, clarified by its relation to Kant's understanding of dialectic. Contradiction as such is a determination of reflection, a moment of the logic of essence, and we need more preparation for that context. We haven't, for example, come close to the issue of the full and detailed status of the "negation of negation" in Hegel's speculative logic.

But in keeping with the overview attempted here, there are a few general points that Wolff has made that are worth keeping in mind. The first major issue is the one we have been dealing with. Hegel treats contradiction and in general the status of negation and negativity as *something real*, not merely the result of a logical operation on a predicate or a proposition. In Wolff's account, there are two important contexts for understanding how Hegel could claim such a thing.

First, we need to recall Kant's differentiation between logical contradiction, dialectical contradiction (paradigmatically in the antinomies), and what Kant defended as real opposition (*Entgegensetzung*). Kant tried to define the first wholly in terms of his doctrine of analyticity, most evident in the example of affirming and denying the same thing of the same subject at the same time (or in terms of logically false assertions). Dialectical contradictions, however, were *illusions*, only apparent contradictions. This account is the one that obviously interested Hegel, especially with respect to his different view of the origin of the appearance of a contradiction. Kant argued that, in the case of the mathematical antinomies (the first two), a kind of category mistake about the subject of the antinomies—"the world," that it is the sort of object that could have a beginning in time and limit in space, and a "complex substance," that it is the sort of object that could consist of simple parts, or of infinitely divisible parts—masks the true resolution of the antinomies. This is that there is only an apparent contradiction. In reality, as

70. Wolff 2013, 89. See *SL* 21.92 as well.

noted previously, upon analysis the two theses are contraries, and thus can both be false (and they are), although not both true at the same time. The world cannot be said either to have a beginning or not; a complex substance cannot be said to be either composed of simples or infinitely divisible. In the case of the dynamical antinomies, upon proper reflection on the subject of the claim, we can discover an equivocation on whether that subject is understood as a thing in itself or as an appearance. Once that is clarified, we can see that the two of these are subcontraries, not contradictory; they cannot both be false, but they can both be true (and they are). In both cases, we get indirect proof of the truth of transcendental idealism.

The same sort of clarification of an illusory contradiction is found in the contemporary “dual aspect” interpretations of that idealism. According to this view of the passages that seem to support it,⁷¹ the position can seem committed to a contradiction. The same object considered from one point of view is capable of spontaneous causality and from another point of view is necessitated. This is only an apparent contradiction, presumably, once we know how to differentiate appearances and things in themselves as two different possible “aspects” (if we can). This is not the way Hegel will argue that freedom and necessity can be understood as complementary, not contradictory, but “reflective resolution” like this is on the agenda after Kant. (That is, there might be *other* “contextualizations” besides this one by virtue of which what appears as a contradiction can be shown not to be, especially other ways in which the “both true” strategy of the subcontraries can be used.)⁷²

But also of importance for understanding the assumptions that go into Hegel’s approach according to Wolff is that Kant was an early defender of Newton on the relation of oppositions in nature, or of positive and negative magnitudes (from his early 1763 essay on the subject), and as the quotation from Brandom notes above, this is the link between Brandom’s modal realism and the historical context laid out in detail by Wolff. An object can be at rest because of the lack of a motive power, but it would be a mistake to think of all negative possibilities like this. It can also be at rest because of an opposing force equal to the thing’s motive force. Critics like Crusius were aghast at the idea of forces having positive and negative values.⁷³ But Kant understood that such “values” (and here again an important precedent for Hegel) *had*

71. E.g., *CPR* Bxxvii–xxviii, A35/B51, A360.

72. Cf. Wolff (1979, 342) on the “reflexions-logisch” character of the “substrate” in question.

73. Cf. Wolff’s (1979, 343) account.

those values in relation to each other, not absolutely, that they were relative values, arbitrarily reversible even. In the collision of two bodies, the acceleration of one will change by the measure of the force that opposes (“negates”) its motion. In the same sense, a hundred-dollar debt cannot be understood as just a lack of a hundred dollars. Many people lack a hundred dollars but are not in debt. The debt is a “negation” of, even in contradiction to, a credit of a hundred dollars.

Wolff also shows that developments in mathematics, of which Hegel was well aware, also contributed to Hegel’s reflections on the reality of negation. For mathematicians were just beginning to understand that negative numbers could not be understood on the model of subtraction, or, said in a Hegelian way, that there was something “positive” about negative numbers, apparent, say, in their sums. (The sum $-4 + -5 = -9$ cannot be accounted for if the negative sign is confined to subtraction. The notion of adding “subtracted quantities” makes no sense.)⁷⁴

So in the sense in which we discussed, logical contraries as opposed to each other, not indifferent to each other (a horse’s being a mammal means not just that it lacks the properties of reptiles but that it cannot have them), the reality of such opposition, the impossibility of rendering intelligible, even just describing, without conceding that there is such a reality, can be seen as continuous with such considerations as Wolff’s on opposition. In a loose sense (Hegel’s sense) something can be considered a form of contradiction if that thing’s qualitative determination excludes or “contradicts” its contrary. (Very roughly, it must have a positive and a negative value.)

This is not the sense of contradiction throughout the *Logic*, but it gives us enough background (a) to appreciate that Hegel is neither a lunatic for saying that “everything is contradictory,”⁷⁵ nor a mystical Heraclitean and (b) to consider a couple of significant examples of the “movement” Hegel generates by invoking the notion in the logic of being.

74. Wolff 1979, 347ff.

75. See Wolff (1984, 198) and the general principle: whenever Hegel seems to be denying the law of noncontradiction, he is denying any formalist conception of the law as having unconditional validity. What contradicts what cannot be expressed as such, formally, as in the example of the antinomies as contraries and subcontraries. See also a similar point made throughout Redding 2007 on the ineliminability of “context” in such putatively formal determinations.

PART II

5

THE LOGIC OF BEING: THE “GIVEN” AS A LOGICAL PROBLEM

The Beginning

Hegel accepts a distinction fundamental to Western rationalism, indeed fundamental to metaphysics in the Western tradition. He clearly concedes that we can learn such things as why someone did something, why a fire started, or what the human kidney is for only *empirically*. But we cannot be said to learn empirically that actions are bodily movements describable intentionally (or intentional under some description, that this is what makes such movements actions), that every event necessarily succeeds some other event according to a rule that, qua rule, has a general form, a type-type claim of causal connection, or that parts of organisms have purposes and must be explained in terms of those purposes, or that some actions are good, others not. We learn empirically that this or that being has this or that quality, but we cannot learn empirically what it is for qualities to inhere in substances, substances that cannot themselves inhere in anything, or that there must be this distinction. We shall see later that these claims properly make up the domain of what Hegel calls “judgments,” from which he distinguishes mere propositions, but the obvious question has always been: if the ground for any such claim is not empirical, what could it be?

The first *Denkbestimmung* under interrogation in the *SL* is perhaps the most famous of the questions that belong in the “nonempirical” category, and, famously, the most elusive. In fact, Hegel begins his book with his own version of this elusiveness, and so begins with a kind of Hegelian irony, one

that is subtle to the point of invisibility. The first “thought-determination,” *Denkbestimmung*, to be considered is the concept “Being,” *Sein*. We begin in effect at the beginning of philosophy, with “Father Parmenides” and so with the beginning of Western rationalism. Parmenides reasoned (a good candidate for the first philosophical or metaphysical thought) that all that could be intelligibly *thought* is “what there is,” Being, so *that is all there could be*. Not-being could not be intelligibly thought; it was unintelligible, *alogos*, and *therefore* could not be. But that meant that anything that relied on the possibility of intelligible not-being *could not be* as well. And that meant that both differentiation (something not-being another), and change (something changing from a state of not-being something to being something else, or from being to not-being) could not be, despite the appearances. Nothing was different from anything else, and nothing ever changed. Even saying what is not, false judgments, could not really *be* on such an account, despite appearances, despite “The Way of Seeming.”

Hegel accepts the challenge of the hypothesis, the thought of anything at all, or in his terms “indeterminate immediacy,” as his beginning. (As throughout, by the thought of anything at all, we do not mean the mere entertaining of some possibility. We mean *the possible knowledge* of anything at all, and so a form of judgment.) Parmenides reasoned that not being could not be, so being was indeterminate, unlimited, and unchanging. Hegel reasons (and here the irony) that, on the contrary, such a thought entails that not-being *can not but be*, since by thinking mere Being so understood, we think not anything at all, but nothing, *Nichts*.

This beginning, Hegel emphasizes, must be “presuppositionless,” and some commentators have noted that this insistence alone might allow us to understand the opening logical movement of the book, that the implications of such a strong insistence on presuppositionlessness can be understood to “drive” the development forward. But we have already seen that Hegel does not believe there is such a thing as absolute presuppositionlessness. That would amount to something like an oracular manifestation: “Being!” And from such a moment nothing would follow. Besides, we already know from the previous chapter that there is a certain theoretical and a certain practical presupposition clearly made for the enterprise of the *Logic* to make any sense. To repeat the passage:

But if no presupposition is to be made, if the beginning is itself to be taken immediately, then the only determination of this beginning is that it is to

be the beginning of logic, of thought as such. There is only present [*vorhanden*] the resolve [*Entschluß*], which can also be viewed as arbitrary [*Willkühr*], of considering [*betrachten*] thinking as such. (21.56)

We have presupposed “thought as such,” and we have presupposed the resolve to consider “thinking as such.” So, to make as explicit as possible both such starting points, we have to say that the opening as such is *the resolve to attempt to think Being as such*. (The grammar is important. That is, it is the resolve to grasp, directly apprehend such an object of thought.) This is what will fail (or more precisely, will prove itself to be incomplete as a possible thought), stated in those terms, and through that failure we learn that any thinking must be the attempt to think that being as such is *X or Y or whatever*. We learn the essential discursivity of thought and the first determination of being as such, determinacy, articulability. (This lesson is what Aristotle wants us to learn when he argues that being as such cannot be a *highest* genus. There can be, by definition, no higher-order predicate by which such a being could be determined as what it is. This is, I want to claim, the same lesson we are to learn at the beginning of Hegel’s *Logic*.)

One can think of the matter this way. If the question is “What is it simply to be?” (Heidegger’s “What is the meaning of Being?” without the misleading substantivization of the infinitive in English), it would seem impossible to avoid concluding that to be is always to be something or other, to be determinate. Otherwise, whatever there is could not be distinct from anything else that is. Being would not be bounded off as just the thought of being and nothing else. But a *being’s* determinacy is nothing other than, the other side of the same coin as, its determinability by *thought*, its being discriminable as what it distinctly is, as it could be put—all in the light of the interpretation offered here of EL §24.¹ To be is to be intelligible. Its determinacy simply amounts to a thing’s distinguishability from *what it is not*, or the moment in which a particular event occurs, not any other moment. And herein lies Parmenides’s famous problem. This would, as noted, appear to commit us to the existence of “what is not,” since any determinate A, by not being B, seems to make use of “not being B,” and not-being cannot be. (It does not, of course; this all rests on a confusion between not-being as not being anything, not existing, and being as being *other than*, and so being something

1. This already amounts to the original sin of Western metaphysics for Heidegger, taking the measure of being to be *logos*.

else, as Plato demonstrated in *The Sophist*, but we are starting at a level of abstraction where we must take the problem on. Hegel will agree with the Eleatic Stranger's claim that Parmenides misunderstood his own thought.) The same goes for something changing from one moment to the next (to "*not* that moment"). Hence, Parmenides's confusion: no differentiability, no change, despite appearances.

The Strategy

With all this in mind, here is an attempt to sketch how I understand the opening claim of the *SL*. (And I am going to limit myself to the opening moment, and even at that to the question of the way Hegel's discussion illuminates his understanding of the relationship between logic and metaphysics.) We begin with an attempt to assume nothing about determinacy and determinations. The idea is to begin with the thought of anything at all, in its immediate indeterminacy, simply being, *Sein*. But the thought of anything at all in its immediate indeterminacy is not the thought of anything; the object of such thought is nothing, *Nichts*. Nothing is excluded, so nothing is included. Quine is right: the answer to "what is there?" is easy. "Everything." But the attempted thought of immediate indeterminacy has a different content than the thought *that* the content of such a determination is nothing. (As many critics have pointed out, if this were not so, the two thoughts would be simply equivalent and the *Logic* would "stop.") It is a failed thought, not the thought of this failure or even just the enactment of the failure. This is the beginning of everything of significance in the *Logic*; it (the thought of *Sein* being nothing other than *Nichts*) is the *reflective* relation to what is being thought that is inseparable from anything possibly being thought. It is thought's apperceptive moment. Anyone truly thinking the thought of indeterminate immediacy is just thereby thinking what it could be to think such a thought, as discussed in chapter 3 here. Just thereby, thinking is *thinking its failure to be thinking*, not thinking of a strange object, *Nichts*. It is only in this sense that the first moment has a second moment, a realization of what thinking must think to be thinking of anything: in general, determinate being (*Dasein*), and so the conditions of determinacy, which at the minimum level turn out to be qualitative and quantitative predicates, and their relation to each other in a category Hegel calls measure (*Maß*). But this all refers to a content determinately distinguished from what it is not, a something as opposed to an

(its) other, finite being in its contrastive relation with infinity, the one in its relation to the many.

All of this is in keeping with what he wrote about the development or progression of the moments of the book. In EL §17, Hegel says that the “unique purpose, deed and goal” of his science is “to arrive at the Concept of the concept and so to arrive at its return [into itself] and contentment [*Befriedigung*].” And in the addition to §83 he says simply, “Only the Concept is what is true, and, more precisely, it is the truth of Being and of Essence. So each of these, if they are clung to in their isolation, or by themselves, must be considered at the same time as untrue.” This is the process we begin in the logic of being.

Such a reflective determination reveals both that such putative immediate indeterminacy must itself already be a determination,² and that such a putative content, anything at all in its immediate indeterminacy, has not been transformed, has not “become” *Nichts*, but that it always already was, had *always already*, as Hegel puts it, already “gone over” into *Nichts*. (As noted before, determination, *bestimmen*, can mean anything from any sort of specification of determinacy to something much closer to a fundamental, basic, or essential determination, as in the frequent translation of Fichte’s *Die Bestimmung des Menschen* as *The Vocation of Man*. That latter essentialist possibility will now begin to be much more important.)³

He puts this point and the dual-level structure of all the moments in the *Logic* in an unusual way that nevertheless clearly descends from the apperceptive character of judgment as a logical claim:

Thus it is the whole concept which we must consider, first as existent Concept [*seyender Begriff*], and then as concept; in the one case it is concept only implicitly, in itself, the concept of reality or being; in the other, it is the concept as such, the concept that exists for itself . . . Accordingly, the first

2. Again, this is something of crucial importance for understanding our leitmotif: the inseparability yet distinguishability of concept (mediation) and intuition (immediacy) as logical moments. The inseparability of form (*Nichts*, differentiation) and being (immediacy, pure self-relation), the illusory or *Schein* status of being just as such, is the beginning and end of Heidegger’s dissatisfaction with Hegel. The other way to state this Hegelian truth is that what it means to be is to be intelligible (differentiated, formed), which for Heidegger is a decision, not a discovery. See Rohs 1982, 56ff.

3. Cf. Rohs 1982, 71–72.

division must be between the logic of the concept as being and of the concept as concept, or (if we want to avail ourselves of otherwise familiar, but very indeterminate and therefore very ambiguous expressions) in objective and subjective logic. (SL 21.46)⁴

I take him to be saying here what was glossed above as the opening move: “Anyone truly thinking the thought of indeterminate immediacy is just thereby thinking what it could be to think such a thought . . . Just thereby, thinking is *thinking its failure to be thinking*, not thinking of a strange object, *Nichts*” (“in the one case it is concept only implicitly, in itself, the concept of reality or being; in the other, it is the concept as such, the concept that exists for itself”).

Another formulation:

Whatever richer name be given to it than is expressed by mere being, the only legitimate consideration is how such an absolute enters into *discursive* knowledge [*denkende Wissen*] and the enunciation of this knowledge. (21.64)

This emphasis on showing the discursive nature of knowledge of any kind is no doubt the reason he begins the book with a *sentence fragment*, the linguistic representation of a thought that is, can be, no true thought, as signaled by its fragmentary linguistic representation. As it stands, it is a bit oracular or vatic, or at least like a chapter or division heading, not a part of the book proper. But it is not a title. It is the first “moment” of the book proper. “Being, pure being—without further determination” is what Hegel wrote (21.68). (In the EL, the beginning is less dramatic. He just states that being is the “concept in itself,” and so must be developed. He calls that development

4. All of this depends on something that has been defended here since chapter 2. It is a source of some confusion among commentators. Some want to say: the *Logic* begins not with the concept of being, but *with being*. Being is not a concept, even though concepts might be considered one of the beings. But this is exactly what Hegel is trying to reject as already a confused form of realism, one that is already a subjectivism (about concepts). Being certainly “is” a concept. That is, *it is intelligible*. It is, if it is to be thought at all, its intelligible form, and this is not something distinct from what it is to be “being.” It is *just what it is* to be being. And the concept is that moment of pure thinking without which being would not be intelligible. None of this “derives” existence from the Concept. (See Hegel’s analysis of the problems in the standard understanding of the ontological argument, EL §194Z.) This is another and the most sweeping variation on his core claim: Logic is metaphysics.

a *Heraussetzen*, a “setting out” that already links intelligibility to discursive intelligibility [§84].)

We recall how important this notion was in chapter 3, and Hegel here is doing something like making a case for, or at least in some way showing us, the *apperceptively* discursive nature of any possible discursive intelligibility. This also means that in judging anything, I am always also implicitly holding open the possibility of the self-correction of judging. (For anything to count as an instance of a correction of a judgment, it must count as a *self*-correcting.) That is, just being in the state of judging incorrectly, and then coming to be in the state of judging correctly, is not thereby *self*-correcting. Or, any judgment always implicitly applies, is implicitly applying, the concept of judgment to itself. It is a judgment because I, and nothing other than I, make it the case that I judge—that I, and nothing other than I, commit myself, one could say (Fichte’s “*self*-positing”).

As Kant insisted, in any such case I must be able to “stand above” what I judged and what I now judge correctly and take the latter to be a correction of the former in order for it to be that, a correction. Otherwise, there is just a succession of episodes. This is why he could say that the understanding, the power of claiming, is the synthetic unity of apperception (in the same way, I am ultimately claiming in this book, Hegel is claiming that what he calls the concept is the synthetic unity of apperception). As in Kant’s explanation:

“Bodies are heavy.” By that, to be sure, I do not mean to say that these representations necessarily belong to one another in the empirical intuition, but rather that they belong to one another in virtue of the necessary unity of the apperception *in* the synthesis of intuitions, i.e. in accordance with the principles of the objective determination of all representations insofar as cognition can *come from* them, which principles are all derived from the principle of the transcendental unity of apperception. (CPR B142)

This also means, as we have been stressing, that given certain concepts of the power of knowing—say, a knowing that must be indeterminate and immediate, a “resolve” to begin with that notion—we already have *thereby* the concept of the object of such pure knowing, *Being*. If we are talking about a case of *knowing*, as we are, the two are, must be, inseparable (all in keeping with the interpretation of the “identity of thought and being” presented in chapter 2). There is no question, here or anywhere in the *Logic*, of the need to “move” from the order of knowing to the order of being. If that were claimed

to be necessary, how would we have begun with a case of *knowing*?⁵ Hegel himself notes this frequently when he summarizes what is going on by referring to either order. For example:

There is nothing to be intuited in it, if one can speak here of intuiting; or, it is only this pure empty intuiting itself. *Just as little is anything to be thought in it, or, it is equally only this empty thinking.* (21.69, my emphasis)

Note again, this is not the introduction of a strange content, *Nichts*. It is the claim that nothing is being thought in “thinking being.” It is a thinking that is not really a thinking. As he will say later (at 11.246), the putative opening is just *Schein*, a showing in which nothing is shown.

Expressed at the order of knowing, this all reflects the great shift from pre-Kantian rationalism to post-Kantian idealism. To use Brandom’s formulation, the question of adequate knowledge shifts from our having grasped some content or object (how clearly and distinctly we can see it or how firmly grasp it) to the nature of the object’s claim on us, or to the authority, legitimacy of our claim to know, our right to make such a claim and the nature of that right, not what the character of the mental relation is between the mind and its object. Seeing something in perception, for example, can be a ground for such a claiming. “How do you know there is a robin in that tree?” “Because I saw it.” But then—and here is the tricky part—it must also be the case that *what* we see or grasp be *of such a form* that it accords with or fits in with, can be intelligible in, such *forms* of claims as we can make. It need not itself have strictly judgmental form, but it must be such as could be rendered intelligible in the content of a judgmental claim.⁶ So there is no objection in Kant or among the relevant post-Kantians, in their denial that thinking is a kind of perceiving or primarily receptive, to the general form of such claims as “I know it because I *saw* it,” especially because that is the invitation to establishing that it can be seen by anyone. That is how it functions as perceptual ground. But for thinking as such, there is nothing like: “I know that is the essence because I had an essence-intuition, a *Wesenschau*.” Establishing, at the level of thought alone, that an essence is X or Y can be done only discursively, if at all.

5. At least in this one respect, the situation is the same as in Wittgenstein’s *Tractatus*. The world is all that is the case, states of affairs, because the basic form of intelligibility is the proposition, which pictures states of affairs, within logical space, the space of possibility defined by all actual atomic objects. There is no inference here.

6. Readers will note here the influence of McDowell’s formulation of the issue.

Fichteian Formulations

This is the structure that becomes explicit, for itself, in the logic of essence, and it will allow a direct discussion about the reflected or two-level (essence and appearance) character of being, of what could be truly known. It is even clearer there that any such essence is never seen or intuited but *posited*, something that will give rise to its own problems here in the next chapter. But this reflective dimension is implicit and appealed to in the logic of being, and Hegel often tries to clarify his point by reference to Fichte. This is not the most pellucid path to insight about the issue, but it is possible to restate what he is trying to say. In his 1794 *Wissenschaftslehre*, Fichte insists on the same point that is made in the first move in the *Logic* (a move that turns out not to be a move but something like an always already made move) by pointing out the difference logically between “A” and “A = A.” For the latter, we need (for its thinkability at all, and so for the intelligibility of any A, a condition [its identity as itself] of its being determinately A), an “I” that is “= I.” (This is the claim we saw above in Hegel’s terms: that being itself is only the concept in itself; the concept must become for itself as the thought *that* being is such and such.) But this identification is something done, a *Tat*, the equivalent here of “bringing contents to the unity of apperception” in Kant’s account, an active unifying necessary for the I to be continuously that I in experience. (Thinking is a productive power.) Fichte needed a new word for the full expression of a thinking, a pure spontaneity, a productive power, that is always also the consciousness of thinking: *Tathandlung*.

But, as he also notes, this first principle, $A = A$, is not possible unless it has also made possible the thought $A \neq \sim A$. This requires that we understand how the I posits the not-I and itself (the Fichteian equivalent to the necessity of a concept-intuition distinction). This is probably far enough into Fichte to make the initial point about positing and negating in their connection with the apperception point. (We can see the parallel with Hegel in the third basic principle: for any A to be distinguished from $\sim A$, we need the logical principle of *Bestimmung*, determination, which Fichte calls divisibility or determinability, or as we might say, *Teilbarkeit*. Kant’s transcendental unity of apperception reappears as Fichte’s self-positing I, and again as Hegel’s *Begriff*.) Another way to put the Fichteian version, given that there can be no beginning with simply “being as it is in itself,” but rather such a presuppositionless beginning must be “*thinking* being,” is that the beginning proper is *positing*, the Fichteian general term for thinking, the analogue of which on the

objective side must be “determinacy,” an A that is not $\sim A$, Hegel’s term for which is *Werden*, becoming.

Of course, the notion of becoming immediately suggests a temporal development, and that seems to capture the idea of something at the same time being and not being, as in being what state it is in, but always becoming other than that state, as in any living being’s always also dying, or at least changing, developing, deteriorating. But Hegel means the term to refer to a more general logical feature of determinacy in general, as in this important passage, which I will quote in full. When he wants to explain what he takes the beginning to show, his language is not linked to anything necessarily temporal.

However, anything which it says over and above simple immediacy would be something concrete, and this concrete would contain a diversity of determinations in it. But, as already remarked, the enunciation and exposition of this concrete something is a process of mediation which starts with *one* of the determinations and proceeds to another, even though this other returns to the first—and this is a movement which, moreover, is not allowed to be arbitrary or assertoric. Consequently, that from which the *beginning* is made in any such exposition is not something itself concrete but only the simple immediacy from which the movement proceeds. Besides, what is lacking if we make something concrete the beginning is the demonstration which the combination of the determinations contained in it requires. (21.64–65)

In other words, the “movement” Hegel introduces is what he always refers to as logical movement, development, logical life, even “pulsation.” This will be discussed later in chapter 7. When he introduces that notion in this context, it is clear that he is referring to such *logical* movement, and that, paradoxically, any use of the temporal image is of something that has *always already occurred*. He even explicitly stresses this odd temporal point.

Pure being and pure nothing are therefore the same. The truth is neither being nor nothing, but rather that being has passed over into nothing and nothing into being—“has passed over” [*übergegangen*], not passes over [*übergeht*]. But the truth is just as much that they are not without distinction; it is rather that *they are not the same*, that they are absolutely distinct yet equally unseparated and inseparable, and that *each* immediately *vanishes in its opposite*. Their truth is therefore this *movement* of the immediate

vanishing of the one into the other: *becoming*, a movement in which the two are distinguished, but by a distinction which has just as immediately dissolved [*aufgelöst*] itself. (21.69)⁷

To return to Fichte, Hegel is wary of putting things that Fichtean way cited above, partly because he thinks that Fichte has left unclear how the “subject-object” opposition most of all typical of limited, *Verstand*-thinking is to be understood (as Hegel thinks he has done in his *Phenomenology*), partly because he thinks announcing a beginning as something like “thinking being” invites treating the issue as a matter of psychology. Here is how he puts his wariness.

In this connection, there is the further essential observation to be made that, although the “*I*” might well be determined to be *in itself* pure knowledge or intellectual intuition and declared to be the beginning, in science we are not concerned with what is present *in itself* or as *something inner*, but with the determinate being [*Dasein*] rather of what in *thought* is inner and with the *determinateness* [*Bestimmtheit*] which this inner assumes in that existence. (21.64, translation modified)⁸

His point is that if we understand the presuppositionless beginning in more idealist terms, beginning with the *I*, this already presupposes a distinc-

7. Hegel will himself invoke the language of coming-to-be (*Entstehen*) and passing-away (*Vergehen*), as at 21.93; but as the passages we have looked at already show, how a thought-determination can be said to come-to-be (*Sein*) and how that thought passes away into its other (*Nichts*) is an “oscillation” in *thought’s* act of determining, judging, saying what Being is, passing over into its ceasing to be being and being nothing. In general, the language of “distinct yet inseparable” is the most important formulation for understanding Hegel’s critique of Kant’s treatment of concept and intuition, which, for Hegel, he treats as distinct and separable. See Pippin (2005) for more on this issue. It is especially important because so many commentators take Hegel’s critique to be a complete conflation of concept and intuition, as if there were no distinction.

8. The English translator, di Giovanni, regularly translates *Dasein* as “external existence.” I can understand his reasons (see lxviii), but given Hegel’s constant insistence that the subject of the *Logic* is actuality and not existence, and that there is no “external” implied by *Dasein*, and given that “there-being” in the recent, new translation of the EL is virtually meaningless, I have returned to the more conventional translation, determinate being, however imperfect it is. The use of *seiyender Begriff* in the passage cited earlier is another illustration of why the translation of *Dasein* as existence can be confusing. An example of the problem is immediately apparent in the passage under question. “Determinateness” in the next line will seem to the English reader to be cognate with “determinate being,” but the former term is *Bestimmtheit*. See Bowman (2017, 221n7) for a similar argument against translating *Dasein* as “existence” and in favor of Bowman’s suggestion, “being-determinate,” which seems to me fine.

tion between I and not-I, and that is a distinction that must be *made*. Seeing that is seeing the first lesson in the necessity of determinacy, and it is basically the same point Hegel makes when his argument shows that any such beginning must be *Dasein*, determinate being (or the *tode ti*, in Aristotle's terms), something that allows us to "unfold" the conditions of such necessary determinacy. This original duality between *Nichts* and *Sein*, now that, from chapter 4, we can understand what Hegel means by considering thinking itself as a negating, will assume a very general importance. It is the duality between mediation and immediacy, differentiation and unity, and form and what is formed, and amounts to the core argument of the *Logic* (the inseparability yet distinguishability of these moments). The issue will now rise to a kind of prominence and self-consciousness in the crucial treatment of ground, *Grund*. (Form will be the "ground" of both "unity" and "difference.")⁹

Put another way: a concept conceived as "empty of content," and so not the thought of anything determinate, is the thought of anything at all. And since that is the thought of nothing in particular, we assume that it must acquire such a content extraconceptually. But the concept of a conceptually unmediated mere matter is no content in particular, and must assume some conceptual differentiation to be any determinate content at all.¹⁰ It is all very well to say that Kant gets himself into this trouble by an abstract separation

9. Rohs (1982) on this general issue is, throughout his book, invaluable.

10. What Hegel says about what can be said about pure being is at the very pinnacle of the book's abstraction, and that is saying something. We can say that pure being is "equal to itself [*sich selbst gleich*]" and not unequal with respect to another [*auch nicht ungleich gegen anderes*]" (21.68). Not unequal with respect to another means that the notion is not in some way differentiable with respect to any other. If it were differentiable it would be unequal with another. That is, it appears, Hegel's way of invoking the identity of indiscernibles. Two things qualitatively or in any other way absolutely equal to themselves in the same way would be the same thing. An internal difference is necessary so that one thing can be said to be "unequal" with respect to another. A lover of paradox might say that Hegel does believe in one case of nonidentical indiscernibles, Being and Nothing. But he clearly thinks Nothing should have a different meaning from Being, or even a different semantic content, so they could not be counted as indiscernible. That is the whole paradox: one kind of indeterminateness is to be different from another kind, but cannot be. He indulges the paradox in saying:

To intuit or to think nothing has therefore a meaning; the two are distinguished and so nothing is (concretely exists) in our intuiting or thinking; or rather it is the empty intuiting and thinking itself, like pure being. Nothing is therefore the same determination or rather absence of determination, and thus altogether the same as what pure being is. (21.69)

There is an excellent discussion of the Leibnizian identity principle as it bears on Hegel in Southgate (2014).

of concept from intuition as distinct contributors to experience, but the only resolute response possible introduces the concept of a “mediated immediacy,” which in the *Logic* is called “becoming,” *Werden*. That, though, is not a resolution but a difficult problem, as we shall see below, a paradox that brings us all the way back to the statement of method in the introduction.

What we must try to understand to be happening in this claim is the following:

The one thing needed to achieve scientific progress—and it is essential to make an effort at gaining this quite simple insight into it—is the recognition of the logical principle that negation is equally positive, or that what is self-contradictory does not resolve itself into a nullity, into abstract nothingness, but essentially only into the negation of its particular content; or that such a negation is not just negation, but is the negation of the determined fact which is resolved, and is therefore determinate negation; that in the result there is therefore contained in essence that from which the result derives—a tautology indeed, since the result would otherwise be something immediate and not a result. Because the result, the negation, is a determinate negation, it has a content. It is a new concept but one higher and richer than the preceding—richer because it negates or opposes the preceding and therefore contains it, and it contains even more than that, for it is the unity of itself and its opposite.—It is above all in this way that the system of concepts is to be erected—and it has to come to completion in an unstoppable and pure progression that admits of nothing extraneous.

An Extended Analogy

What I propose to do at this point is to approach the issue of the beginning argument with an extended analogy to another dimension of the same point, made in the *PhG* about immediacy, but which can be called in general the Hegelian problem with “the given” in epistemological terms, “immediacy” in logical terms.¹¹

11. Hegel appeals to this analogy himself. For example:

The facility that we attain in any sort of knowledge, art, or technical expertness, consists in having the particular knowledge or kind of action present to our mind in any case that occurs, even, we may say, immediate in our very limbs, in an outgoing activity. In all these instances immediacy of knowledge is so far from excluding mediation that the two things are linked together—immediate knowledge being actually the product and result of mediated knowledge. (EL §66)

There is an extended apagogic argument in the first three chapters of Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* that is meant to show the impossibility of any model of experiential knowledge that is understood to be based on a foundation that consists simply in the direct sensory presence of the world to the mind, a putative consciousness of a content that is contentful just by being passively apprehended, contentful on its own, in no relation to any other or any remembered content. By imagining such a model and showing that it has some inner incoherence or necessarily raises a question that cannot be answered in its terms, Hegel shows that the possibility of any such determinate consciousness requires a capacity beyond mere differential responsiveness, a capacity that, among other things, allows a perceiver to track, keep attending to, any such content over time, and that allows the perceiver to fulfill a condition of such determinacy: that the differentiability of such content from what is other than it must also be possible. This is supposed to establish the impossibility of any epistemological atomism, and to undermine any idea of a strict separability between our sensible and intellectual faculties. This is so because fulfilling these conditions on experiential determinacy requires, he wants to show, the exercise of spontaneous conceptual capacities in perception itself. This is all not in any way a denial of our reliance on direct sensible contact with objects in gaining empirical knowledge, or a denial of the difference between sensible and intellectual capacities. It is meant as a denial that such sensory receptivity can properly play its role in a model of empirical knowledge all *on its own*, conceived as independent of, or prior to, as he would say, any conceptual mediation. This treatment in the *PhG* is a useful analog because Hegel tells us directly in the remark to EL §84 that the treatment in the EL is the logical version of the general problem of "sensory consciousness."

But Hegel also wants to pose such an issue at a different level of abstraction, and he is right to understand that the more abstract formulation is primary, is that on which the conceptual coherence of his favored account of experience ultimately depends. That prior, more abstract formulation of the logical formulability of any such given is what we have introduced in the previous section. The problem at what Hegel would call the logical level is how

And in the *Philosophy of Spirit*, he goes so far as to say:

intuition on the other hand is consciousness filled with the certainty of reason, whose object is rationally determined and consequently not an individual torn asunder into its various aspects but a totality, a unified fullness of determinations. (PS §449)

we are to understand the conceptual possibility appealed to in this summary, the possibility of a *mediated immediacy*. The notion is obviously problematic in its very formulation. If any such immediacy is to be considered as mediated, then it is not immediate. A canceled event is not a kind of happening, a kind of event. The event did not happen. A mediated immediacy is no longer an immediacy. Hegel points directly to this problem. (Or to the issue; he does not yet announce it as a problem or even as paradoxical.)

The beginning of philosophy must be either *something mediated* or *something immediate*, and it is easy to show that it can be neither the one nor the other; so either way of beginning runs into contradiction. (21.53)

Or, on the following page:

Here we may quote from it [he is talking about a passage from the *Encyclopedia*] only this, that *there* is nothing in heaven or nature or spirit or anywhere else that does not contain [*enthält*] just as much immediacy as mediation, so that both these determinations prove to be *unseparated* and *inseparable* and the opposition between them nothing real. (21.54)

Obviously “contained” (*enthält*) is a metaphor; the task is to understand the meaning of the metaphor.

A mediated, say, a conceptually articulated, content can of course be further mediated, or articulated. But preserving the informatively sensory dimension of empirical knowledge seems to require (once we accept the “distinct but not separable” point) a notion of mediated *immediacy*. But if we mean, as many have, that the expression summarizes a temporal dynamic, that what *had been* immediately apprehended, was *then* mediated, then we have lost hold both of the claim made earlier above (see his “unseparated and inseparable”), and of the opening arguments of Hegel’s *Phenomenology*. That argument has ruled out such an independent step, or any such two-step account. So the problem is not merely how there can be distinguishable but not separably occurring elements in some whole, like, say, pitch and timbre in a musical note, distinguishable but never occurring separately. The problem is how the logical or conceptual character of this relation *between* activity and receptivity is to be understood, if not in this stepwise way. Hegel’s formulations of the problem seem to take delight in forcing the issue into terms that are initially bewildering.

Immediacy of knowledge is so far from excluding mediation, that the two things are linked together—immediate knowledge being actually the product and result of mediated knowledge. (EL §66)

Brandom on Immediacy

One brief example of not attending to this problem as such is the following. Brandom, in his online, constantly revised manuscript on the *Phenomenology*,¹² carefully and rightly follows a Sellarsian line in distinguishing in Hegel between the immediacy of the act of apprehending (it is noninferential) and any putative immediacy of determinate content (a mere illusion), and then gives his own interesting spin to the issue of what is going wrong with the latter assumption (he describes it as a claim to immediate authority without a corresponding responsibility), but he still speaks frequently of “incorporating the deliverances of immediacy into the mediated structure of contents. These noninferential applications of concepts . . . are wrung from or elicited by the particulars to which the concepts are on that occasion applied.” And he speaks often of a mediation that articulates an immediacy.

And so we get formulations like: “Immediate judgments express a dimension along which particulars exert an authority over the universals or concepts that apply to them.” By his lights, this has to mean that

perceptual observations of things in general are not merely immediate, but they are noninferentially elicited, and so provide a crucial friction for the inferentially articulated Concept: a kind of constraint without which the determinate contentfulness of ordinary empirical concepts would be unintelligible.¹³

He is right to think that *his* formulations should be glossed this way, but we are here moving rapidly away from Hegel and toward Brandom’s own theory of such a two-stage or two-ply process, his “RDRD account,” basically a non-conceptual, matter-of-fact sensory encounter.¹⁴ Without a clarification of the notion of mediated immediacy, this is inevitable. And any two-step process

12. Brandom 2014.

13. Brandom 2014, part 2, 71.

14. For more discussion of this issue, see Pippin 2006.

is always going to open up an unsatisfactory gap, at least by Hegelian lights. (In Hegel's account, experience is not guided or elicited or provoked by sensations. Experience is sensory awareness, and can be sensory awareness, only of particular objects and events, only if that capacity *originally* involves the power of discrimination, a conceiving power, actualized sensorily.) But the issues are hardly clear-cut. Hegel sometimes himself seems to understand all of this as a two-step process. From the Encyclopedia Logic: "thinking is in fact essentially the negation of something immediately given" (*in der Tat ist das Denken wesentlich die Negation eines unmittelbar Vorhandenen* [EL §12A]). This, even though in the same paragraph he denies that these moments are ever distinct and insists that they are always "inseparably bound together" (*in unzertrennlicher Verbindung*).

Recalling the Interpretation

Let me begin by summarizing the main points of the interpretation so far presented.

(i) The *Science of Logic* is the science of pure thinking. Pure thinking's object is itself, what it is to be thinking (where this must also include, at an a priori level, what it is for thought to have objects at all), and is pure in the sense that it is not aided by empirical experience.

(ii) The forms of thought studied by philosophy are the forms without which a thing could not be intelligible as what it is (where what it is is a *determinate* something). We study the intelligibility of what there is by studying judgmental, essentially predicative form.

(iii) The *Logic's* subject matter, what it is trying to make sense of, are the modalities of sense-makings. But, given that Hegel thinks of such modalities of sense-making not as a species-specific "subjective" capacity, but as constitutive of any possible sense, he would not say that this can be distinguished from "making sense of things." (This is another way of saying that logic, properly understood, is metaphysics.)

(iv) Kant pioneered a way of returning to Aristotle's treatment of logic, or a theory of concepts as a kind of metaphysics, without the commitments of rationalist dogmatism. But Kant could not deal adequately with the questions that the approach raises: How do we determine what those conditions are? And can they be rightly confined to what the avoidance of logical contradiction will allow, can the "emptiness" that Kant ascribes to these forms

be maintained? Stated in Kant's terms, Hegel's claim is that general logic, properly understood, is already transcendental logic, properly understood, and transcendental logic, properly understood, is already metaphysics.

(v) This all places enormous pressure on what amounts to a kind of operator in Hegel's *Logic* on which all the crucial transitions depend, something like: "would not be fully intelligible, would not be coherently thinkable, *without* . . ." What follows the "without" is some more comprehensive concept, a different distinction, and so forth. Excluding logical contradictions would be one obvious instantiation of the operator. But as we noted in chapter 2, the domain of the logically possible is obviously far more extensive than the range of what Kant called the "really possible." The latter is what we need if we are to have a logic of the real. And Hegel cannot avail himself of Kant's nonconceptual forms of intuition to establish a priori the sensible conditions that set the boundaries of "the really possible."

(vi) Hegel's debt to Aristotle is again relevant, especially now in avoiding "subjective idealism," or what I have sometimes called "impositionism." Entities are the determinate entities they are "in terms of" or "because of" their concept or substantial form. That is, such a form (or kind) accounts for such determinacy. Such entities embody some measure of what it is truly to be *such* a thing, and instantiate such an essence to a greater or lesser degree. To say that an object is "for its form" is just to say that there is an intelligible dynamic in its development. Various aspects or elements or moments make sense in terms of the concept of the thing. This intelligible dynamic is its concept and is not something that "exists" separate from or supervening on some physical attributes and efficient causation. It just is the intelligible way a development develops; there is nothing "over and above" the development.

(vii) But we know that thinking, for Hegel, is in no sense a kind of perceiving. As in Kant, it is discursive. There is no *nous pathetikos*. Thinking is a productive power, spontaneity. The categorical structure of being is not simply noetically available to, transparent to, the light of reason. So in saying that pure thinking's object is pure thinking itself, we do not mean that thinking attends to a special object or event. We have to say that it determines its own possibility, and this with respect to the possibility of thinking any determinate object.

So it would miss the point to think that, if pure thinking about anything at all were not "checked" or "constrained" by anything at all, or anything other than thought, pure thought would be somehow unregulated, producing its determinations without measure. But thinking considered purely is a

productive power, and nothing can check or constrain its productions other than itself. Any other kind of constraint would not be a normative constraint. Anything of any kind that might count as a constraint is so only if taken by pure thinking to constrain it. That there cannot be anything that admits of contradictory predicates at the same time and in the same sense, and that a thinking of contradictory predicates is not a case of thinking, are two sides of the same constraint and the coin is reason's constraint of itself. This has nothing to do with a faculty's acknowledgments of its limits, as if it is somehow owing to our finitude that we cannot think such thoughts.

Help from Wilfrid Sellars?

With such a background, here is the logical formulation of the problem of the given as the problem of immediacy.

Being is the immediate [*Das Seyn ist das Unmittelbare*]. (SL 11.241)

Here I think we should say: "being" is the "given" in its logical form.

Since the goal of knowledge is the truth, what being is in and for itself, knowledge does not stop at the immediate and its determinations, but penetrates beyond it on the presupposition that behind this being there still is something other than being itself, and that this background constitutes the truth of being. (11.241)

As this passage already indicates, the logic of being is an attempt to demonstrate why there cannot be a logos of being just as such, understood as atomic contents grasped by a receptive mental or sensory power. In Hegel's terms,

Being is *Schein*. The being of *Schein* consists solely in the sublatedness of being, in being's nothingness; this nothingness it has in essence, and apart from its nothingness, apart from essence, it does not exist. It is the negative posited as negative. *Schein* is all that remains of the sphere of Being. (11.246)

The full, official form of the argument is that a distinct logic of being is impossible except if conceived *within* a logic of essence, which Hegel understands as "reflected being," another statement of our most basic problem, aspects of which were already alluded to above. (To be more precise: "con-

ceived within a logic of essence” means, ultimately, under the concept of “actuality,” the proper understanding of the relation between “essence” and “appearance,” yet another higher-order statement of the mediated immediacy problematic.)¹⁵ That alone doesn’t help us much, but seeing the problem as a problem of reflection might get us somewhere. I will make a couple of suggestions. To start, here is a typical formulation of the issue to be addressed:

The opposition between a self-standing immediacy of content or knowing and a mediation that is equally self-standing but incompatible with the former must be set aside, for one thing because it is a mere *presupposition* and an arbitrary *assurance*. Similarly, all other presuppositions or prejudices must be surrendered at the entry to science, whether they be taken from representation or from thought. For it is in science that all such determinations must first be examined and the status of them and their oppositions recognized. (EL §78)

One way to approach what Hegel is getting at is to pay attention to those many instances of the logical issue he presents in the logic of essence. Being and reflected being are one; “appearance and essence” is another version; so are matter and form, and there is an interesting and relevant discussion of Kant’s distinction between reflective and determinate judgments that we will encounter in the next chapter. Now, my suggestion in this context might seem a stretch, but I have found it very helpful and I hope it has some resonance with other readers. This is Sellars’s approach to Aristotle in an important article. It will involve my quoting two long but, for me anyway, extremely helpful paragraphs. First, this is what I take to be Sellars’s formulation of the Kantian theme of an exclusively discursive intellect, and the kind of problem caused in Aristotle by its absence. *It is also Hegel’s point against the sufficiency of the logic of being as such.*¹⁶

Here the guiding thread is that Aristotle’s rejection of Platonism leads him to the idea that since the *fundamentum in re* of the truth of “This is a K” is the K itself (i.e., this-K), rather than the fact that it is a K, there must be a form of knowing which has the K qua nameable (rather than the fact that

15. See the final sentence of EL §64R: “The entire second part of the logic, i.e. the doctrine of essence, deals with the essential, self-positing unity of immediacy and mediation.”

16. I take this point about discursivity to be essentially the same as Bowman’s (2017) claim that the first moment of the *Logic* can be said to be “original synthetic unity” (224–28).

it is a K) as its object (i.e., which combines somehow the (incombinable) characters of being a grasping of this item as a K and of being prior to the idea of its being a K (as contrasted with other actual, or possible, K's). In other words, instead of recognizing that knowledge is *ab initio* the knowledge that this is a K (or that this is f), and is *ab initio* expressible by means of the statement "This is a K" (or "This is f"), Aristotle postulates (and he was not the last to do so) an *ur*-knowing which, if it had a verbal expression, would be properly expressed by a (fictitious) singular term of the form "This-K" and supposes that the thinking expressed by "This is a K," which involves the multiple predicable "a K," is derivative from the direct, simple, and intuitive knowledge of this-K.¹⁷

If this is so, it is just another way to lead us back to the issue of mediated immediacy embedded in "this is a K" as what we know *ab initio*. But if it is true that the form-matter relation inherent in such an issue can be expressed neither as the imposition of a form on an immediate matter (or the mediation of a prior immediacy) nor as an immediate apprehension of a form-matter, K, then this also gives Sellars another way of formulating the Hegelian *aperçus* we have been tracking. It is compressed in this dense but illuminating passage, a kind of model of a "two that is actually a one" dialectic at stake in so much of what Hegel is about. (It helps distinguish both as elements of a unity—moments in the *das Moment*, element sense—as opposed to the *der Moment*, or temporal phase sense.)

Are we to suppose that as in the ordinary sense the spatial togetherness of two individuals (the parts) constitutes a new individual (the whole), so in the metaphorical sense a nonspatial, metaphysical, togetherness of individual matter and individual form (the "parts") constitutes a new (and complete) individual (the "whole")? The answer, I submit, is no, for the simple reason that the individual matter and form of an individual substance are not two individuals but one. *The individual form of this shoe is the shoe itself; the individual matter of this shoe is also the shoe itself, and there can scarcely be a real distinction between the shoe and itself.* What, then, is the difference between individual form and matter of this shoe if they are the same thing? The answer should, by now, be obvious. The individual form of this shoe is the shoe qua (piece of some appropriate material or other—in this case

17. Sellars 1967, 101.

leather) serving the purpose of protecting and embellishing the feet. The individual matter of this shoe is the shoe qua piece of leather (so worked as to serve some purpose or other—in this case to protect and embellish the feet). Thus, the “parts” involved are not incomplete individuals in the real order, but the importantly different parts of the formula (piece of leather) (serving to protect and embellish the feet) projected on the individual thing of which they are true. (My emphasis)¹⁸

Sellars’s formulation of this particular immediacy-mediation point is deeply Hegelian in spirit. (It is what we need: a way of disabusing ourselves of assumptions that make it impossible to understand any modality of immediacy and mediation as inseparable even if necessarily distinguishable.) A form, like a concept, a thing’s concept, or The Concept, is not a thing but the distinct being-at-work of *the whole thing*, in the way in which the *De Anima* tells us in an analogy that the form or soul of the eye, were it a being, would be *seeing*. The “what appears to be two is really one” formulation is also Hegelian.

Here are Hegel’s versions of the same point. First,

Further, form presupposes a matter to which it refers. But for this reason the two do not find themselves confronting each other externally and accidentally; neither matter nor form derives from itself, is *a se*, or, in other words, is eternal. (11. 297)

And,

The two sides of the whole, condition and ground, are therefore one essential unity, as content as well as form. They pass into one another, or, since they are reflections, they posit themselves as sublated, refer themselves to this their negation, and reciprocally presuppose each other. But this is at the same time only one reflection of the two, and their presupposing is, therefore, one presupposing only; the reciprocity of this presupposing ultimately amounts to this, that they both presuppose one identity for their subsistence and their substrate. This substrate, the one content and unity of form of both, is the truly unconditioned; the fact in itself. (11.318)

18. Sellars 1967, 118.

So we are asking the wrong question from the start if we ask how two distinct elements “get put together.” There is no putting together. There is an “always already has been together.” In the same way, human beings are animals, but because they are rational animals, they are not animals in the way that nonrational animals are animals. Their animality, responsive as it is in its affective experience to reason, is already, always already, the animality of a rational creature.¹⁹

The claim that “matter,” in whatever logical register, is to be understood as always enformed and that form is always being enmattered cannot in Kantian terms be leading back to the position that sensible intuiting is a kind of thinking, and thinking is a kind of intuiting, as if along a continuum. That is what Kant has liberated us from, but the promised land requires that we think of matter and form, intuiting and thinking, as absolutely different and logically distinguishable as such, as well as inseparable within a logical whole. (So perceiving is one moment in the *der Moment* sense but two moments in the *das Moment* sense.)

This is not a wholly unfamiliar point and is often expressed in the Aristotelian tradition. The matter of a dog is not any old matter. It must already be the matter-of-a-dog, even though the flesh and bones and organs (each of which is also a form of some matter) are not, considered on their own, a dog. In a related sense, if the dog is dead, the matter is also not dog-matter, so separated from the being-at-work of the species form.²⁰ Here is Hegel’s stab at making the point.

What appears here as the activity of form is, moreover, just as much the movement that belongs to matter itself. The determination that implicitly exists in matter, what matter is supposed to be, is its absolute negativity. [*Die ansichseyen der Bestimmung oder das Sollen der Materie ist ihre absolute Negativität.*] Through it matter does not just refer to form simply as to an other, but this external other is the form rather that matter itself contains locked up within itself. (11.299)

19. This is an idea that goes back to Herder and his unusual naturalism. Taylor (1995) puts it well when he writes that Herder “constantly stresses that we have to understand human reason and language as an integral part of our life form. They cannot be seen as forming a separate faculty which is simply added on to our animal nature” (91). See also Boyle 2016.

20. See Frey (2007) for an exceptionally illuminating discussion of this point.

Or the “material” of a specific house-perception is, in its mode of being as potentiality, already sensory-house-perception material. But the mode of its being so is a “Sollen.”

And Hegel cites several other examples that make the two-is-one point. The appearances of an essence are not, taken singly, what the thing essentially is. They are mere appearances. Yet Hegel insists that essence is nothing other than its appearances, or is the “what it was to be” of its appearances, playing on the tense of *to ti ēn einai* and *gewesen*.²¹ A cube can be red or green, heavy or light, but qua cube it manifests itself as six-sided, each side same-sized squares, and *that* showing is what it is to be a cube, a fact that requires further specification of how a square manifests itself. A cube is *what has been made manifest*, understood in the proper reflective way. Or: “The German language has kept ‘essence’ (*Wesen*) in the past participle (*gewesen*) of the verb ‘to be’ (*sein*), for essence is past—but *timelessly past*—being” (11.241, my emphasis). A person’s character, her essence in that sense, cannot be understood as a mere list of what actions she has undertaken (what is immediately apparent in some context), but neither is it something other than the right reflective understanding of *those actions*, the mediation or reflection of that immediacy (EL §112Z). (Incidentally, this is how Hegel wants us to understand the truth in Kant’s “we only know appearances, we cannot know things in themselves.” We are therewith not talking about two worlds or two points of view, as in the recent controversy in Kant studies. There is no duality. The thing in itself is its appearances, rightly understood. There is no separate entity underlying them, even though knowing only an appearance is not—yet—knowing the essence. In that sense, Kant is exactly right. The thought of noumenal agency is just the thought of a reality that cannot sensibly, empirically appear as such, requires another modality of actuality to be understood as what it is—a *practical* reality. No perceived bodily movement in external, public space can be perceived *thereby* as a human action. But there is nothing “underneath” the bodily movement that cannot be known. We do not *perceive* “what makes the bodily movement an action.” We conceive it as intentional under some description, and that has its own, intellectual, conditions. An even simpler, Hegelian way to make the same point would just be to note that any piece of empirical knowledge, like the knowledge of the temperature at which a metal melts, is incomplete, cannot count fully as knowledge, because it is “conditioned,” dependent ultimately on, presupposes its place in, the systematic

21. Ferrarin (2007) suggests as a translation “what being was before its existence” (137).

unity of scientific law, or ultimately dependent on the “unconditioned.” In what sense then such a conditioned law even counts as knowledge at all is a problem we need not pursue here. Any practical knowledge of the “noumenal” would, understood this way, have to count very heavily on the distinctness of practical knowledge and so “practical reality.”)

Back to Kant

But as we have seen from the beginning, the most difficult context involves the Kantian language of spontaneous mediation of the immediate, and in that context, the material we have looked at suggests that a rethinking of sorts is necessary of what we, and virtually everyone else, characterized as the Kantian innovation perhaps more important than any other: that thinking is discursive, is not itself open to the world in any direct way, qua thinking alone. There is no *lumen naturale*, no *nous pathetikos*, no Jacobi-esque flash of insight. But without some dissolving of what Hegel called the typically metaphysical or *Verstand*-typical either/or of receptive but blind intuition and active but empty thinking, we will not be able to explain the simplest case of concept application. In even the simplified and misleading “impositionist” interpretation of Kant that is so common, we will not be able to explain the determination of *what* to impose if we hold to such an exclusive disjunction. Moreover, Hegel points out early in the *Logic* that Kant himself could not observe such a distinction so quickly.

That is, for Kant, in the Metaphysical Deduction, thought must be able to determine its own moments or forms, not conceptualize an alien content. Accordingly, Kant announces at the very beginning of the first *Critique* that he is seeking what the “cognitive faculty . . . provides out of itself” (B1). This determination is not anything like the “seeing” of thought’s nature as an object; it is spontaneous, productive, but in its relation to itself determines a content. But neither is it the discursive application of a predicate to a concept of an object. And, as noted before, most suggestively for the entire enterprise of the *Logic*, practical reason can determine the form of a rational will that is also itself a substantive content. The self-legislation of the moral law is not volitional anarchy, and neither is it a flash of insight into the law as object; rather it is practical reason’s knowledge of “what” it is to determine its own law.

Consider one of the best examples of this logical point about immediacy and mediation, formulated in these faculty terms. This occurs in Hegel’s

discussion of Kant's distinction from the *Critique of the Power of Judgment* between determining and reflective judgment. As we shall see, he is looking in exactly the right spot in Kant. In a remark in the *Wesenslogik*, Hegel reminds us that Kant

defines judgment in general as the faculty of thinking the particular as contained under the universal. If the universal (the rule, the principle, the law) is given, then the judgment which subsumes the particular under it is determining. But if what is given is only a particular, for which it is up to the judgment to find the universal, then the judgment is reflecting. Here, too, reflection is therefore a matter of rising above the immediate to the universal. (11.254)

But if this distinction is conceived as a disjunction, matters get confusing. Every determinate judgment must also involve a reflective determination of which concept to apply, and every reflective search for a concept must already proceed from a particular sufficiently determinate to warrant the judgment for one rather than another. The two forms of judgment must be considered two moments—in the sense of elements—of one whole, not two different activities. As Hegel puts it in his own inimitable way,

[On the one hand, the immediate is determined] as particular only by being thus referred to its universal; for itself, it is only a singular or an immediate existent. But, on the other hand, that to which it is referred, its universal, its rule, principle, law, is in general that which is reflected into itself, which refers itself to itself, is the essence or the essential. (11. 254)

“Essence or the essential” here means that the particular must already be “universally determined” in some way in order to be “referred to the universal.” (As it is put: “For the universal, the principle or the rule and law to which reflection rises in its process of determination is taken to be the essence of the immediate from which the reflection began.”) Kant, for Hegel, did not fully understand the implications of his identification of these moments, but they intimate what he calls “absolute reflection,” our last example of the territory the notion of mediated immediacy leads us into.

Transcending the immediate from which reflection begins occurs rather only through this transcending; and the transcending of the immediate is the arriving at the immediate. (11.252)

This is Hegelese, but the point he is making is crucial and relatively clear. For any reflective judgment, the “ascending” search for a universal cannot begin unless the particular is already determinate enough (and that must mean conceptually determinate) for the “search” to have a determinate direction, or, really, any direction. And any subsuming, determining judgment cannot “apply” the concept unless the particular has already been apprehended in a way that “called for” the relevant concept, unless a moment of reflecting judgment has already occurred. The two moments are inseparable, and this is the model we need at the logical level if there is to be a mediated immediacy. I think this is the Kantian-Hegelian version of the point Sellars is making about Aristotle.

It is also useful to recall here that Hegel is responding here to something in Kant; he is not correcting Kant. Reflection was a topic in Kant’s logic courses, and “transcendental reflection” another topic in the first *Critique*, and it is possible to argue that many elements of the later topic were present in the critical project before 1790. But by isolating and highlighting the issues, by formulating the problem in a new way, as the problem of reflective judgment, Kant was noting that judgment was important for far more than “subsuming” activities or locating elements in a transcendental geography of faculties, but was a capacity required for the empirically underdetermined and—most importantly—not formalizable and not rule-guided activity by virtue of which rules, concepts, theories, and laws were first possible. In the most general sense, it was this non-rule-guided characteristic, some sort of element of free activity and even “creativity,” that could link the cognitive issues with aesthetic experience and judgment. Appreciating the beautiful was not the application of a concept, the subsumption of an individual under a concept, but a free play activity that nevertheless intimated a harmony, as if conceptually ordered, as if, but not, an instantiation of a concept of purposiveness. Kant seemed to see that there were other activities as well that could not be understood as conceptually determined or empirically guided, but that were nevertheless not arbitrary, merely subjective or heuristic, involving a “discernment” of such purposiveness that it was productive in a way necessary for empirical knowledge.

Since, as we have been noting, Kant’s general position was that “intuitions without concepts are blind,” the possibility that it was not only aesthetic experience, with its exclusion of any unity produced by the application of a concept, that seemed an unusual exception of sorts to this principle, but also concept and theory formation, systematizing, and even life and organic intelligibility that somehow “fit” into that “exception,” gave the issue con-

siderable importance. And these are all aspects of the issue that will recur in the next chapter and in chapter 8. This new inclusion is true even if, as Kant insists, this new activity and its principle do not constitute an objective domain or *Gebiet*, do not ground any “doctrine,” the way the principles of the understanding constitute the realm of nature, and the way practical reason and its law constitute the realm of freedom. The necessity involved in judgment is not, he claimed, constitutive of a domain but rather something *that judgment freely requires of itself*. This notion of requirement, which Kant calls *heautonomy*, we can already see from what has been said above, will form an important link to how Hegel understands his own project (and how he thinks Kant might better have understood his own).

Finally, if we recall that for Hegel, the sublation (*Aufhebung*) of the immediate is the preservation in some way of the immediate, then in the same way that we can imagine that the determination of a person’s character from his deeds, from the immediate appearances, is not a once-for-all determination, but a reflective determination always attentive to future deeds and so an expanded or revised “essence,” and therewith an expanded or revised interpretations of deeds as typical or untypical, we can also imagine that in both logical and empirical determination of conceptual content, this process or movement can be better considered as a kind of oscillation in the same sense (one recalls Fichte’s word, *schweben*), and we will have at least a sketch of how the matter seems to Hegel. A very rough sketch, but at least a sketch.

This should provide the basis for understanding how Hegel understands the transition to the next discussion. However, in accordance with the elemental unity which is immanent in

the concept as basis, and hence in accordance with the inseparability of the concept’s determinations, such determinations, even as differentiated (the concept is posited in their difference), must also stand at least in reference to each another. There results a sphere of mediation, the concept as a system of reflected determinations, that is, of being as it passes over into the in-itselfness of the concept — a concept which is in this way not yet posited for itself as such but is also fettered by an immediate being still external to it. This sphere is the doctrine of essence that stands between the doctrine of being and of the concept. — In the general division of logic in this work, it has been included in objective logic because, although essence is indeed already inwardness, the character of subject is to be reserved *nominatim* for the concept. (SL 21.47)

The Becoming of Essence

The logic of being treats what will be the central problem in the book—accounting for the determinacy of being, and at the same time accounting for the pure concepts indispensable in thinking about the determinacy of anything. In the terms of Kant's first two categorical groupings, these are quality and quantity, that is, the perceptually apprehensible qualities of being, and its quantitative measures. (The logic of essence will be in effect a sustained reflection on the categories of relation and modality, and the concept logic will treat in an extended way the concept of the concept, as Hegel keeps putting it.) This is in keeping with his general approach: to begin with the least "mediated," least theoretically committed determination and argue for the further determinations, further theoretical commitments, without which even these relatively simpler determinations would not be possible. His basic argument in "The Becoming of Essence" is that a mere list of contingent properties and quantitative measures cannot sufficiently count as having determined any subject of those determinations as such. He adds to the complexity by also considering whether appreciating the interrelation of qualitative and quantitative determination, what he calls measure (*Maß*), such as how an increase in the measured quantity of heat can change, effect, qualitative determinations (ice, water, and steam, for example), will provide any help with this problem, and he concludes that it will not.

He summarizes this problem by calling it the problem of "indifference" (*Gleichgültigkeit*), the indifference of the subject of these predicates to the predicates, his way of saying that no true determination, true distinguishing of this from that, has occurred.

More precisely, the term refers to what has developed as the indifference in the relation between the bearer of qualitative, quantitative, and measured properties—that is, the substrate—and those determinations. The determinacy of this relation is what will interest Hegel, that it must be lawlike, not accidental, if such *Denkbestimmungen* are to be successfully determining. And this introduces something like essential predication, that without which the bearer of properties could not be the bearer it is.

So he is especially interested in issues like Newton's inverse square law: Any physical quantity or intensity is inversely proportional to the square of the distance from the source of that physical quantity. He tries to show in this section that its lawlike character must be genuinely lawlike (that it supports robust counterfactual inferences) and so requires a conception of necessity

unavailable to the logic of being. That is, the “law” character, in order to be explanatory, must refer to something fundamentally explanatory, not just a generalization. One could say that Hegel accepts a realist philosophy of science, not a positivist one. The ultimate science will not be a list of what must happen when something else happens but will refer, for example, to the fundamental forces of the universe, in order to “ground” and so genuinely render intelligible this necessity.

The primary example of the logical issue in the history of philosophy is, again, Aristotle. A changeable, sensible thing consists of a portion of matter whose attributes are abstract particulars (the hot, the heavy, the red), among which are a privileged set: those attributes by virtue of which it belongs to a kind. We need this because we must be able to account for the intelligibility of the difference between “This primary substance is white, then red, then brown,” and “This primary substance Y ceases and primary substance X exists instead” (This wine becomes vinegar). And in accounting for primary substances, one cannot treat substantial predicates as just another version of adjectival predication. (Down that road lies a quality-less something—prime matter perhaps, although there is no instance of prime matter as such in the universe.)

So we need, in the usual sense, to be able to explain that when we say that human being is rational animal, members of that species do not just happen to have these differentiae, but “rational animal” is “identical” to what rational animal is, and so not a form of normal adjectival predication. We do not mean human being is identical with its attributes. The whole point is: we need the difference between having properties and *being essentially* what the properties designate. Without this difference (initially between essential and accidental predicates), we will be stuck with the problem of indifference, like Locke’s substance as a *je ne sais quoi*, or, later, the indifference (the lack of a determinate grounding relation) between substance and its attributes in Spinoza. In Hegel’s formulation:

The indifference which can be called absolute, however, is one which, through the negation of every determinateness of being, of quality and quantity and of their at first immediate unity, that is, of measure, mediates itself with itself to form a simple unity. Determinateness is in it still only a state, that is, something qualitative and external which has the indifference as a substrate. (21.373)

Because of this indifference, the fact that such predication involves properties that can come and go contingently, he calls the problem one of a constant “vanishing.”

But that which has thus been determined as qualitative and external is only a vanishing something; as thus external with respect to being, the qualitative sphere is the opposite of itself and, as such, only the sublation of itself. (Ibid.)

He means to point to a general feature of his account, that at this moment qualitative-quantitative predication cannot do what it was enlisted to do, specify the explicability of a thing's being just that thing and nothing else, and this “self-sublating” is the rejection of this presumed sufficiency and the introduction of a “non-being logic,” a distinction that must be introduced to do justice to the original desideratum. So a horse is fast and strong and beautiful and six feet tall, but it becomes neither fast, nor strong, nor beautiful, and shrinks a bit with age, but it is the same horse, and we do not yet understand what it cannot lose and remain the same. This is the problem of indifference.

And, to make his point more insistently, he goes fairly deep into the possibility that the relation itself among regularly occurring properties could ground, limit, and refine a qualitative determinacy. For example, two variables can be said to be “inversely proportional” to each other, and that regularity might fix a determinacy. If all other variables are held constant, the magnitude or absolute value of one inversely proportional variable will decrease if the other variable increases, while their product (the constant of proportionality k) is always the same. That would give us something that looks much more substantial than the comings and goings of qualitative changes. So the gravitational attraction force between two point masses is directly proportional to the product of their masses and inversely proportional to the square of their separation distance. The force is always attractive and acts along the line joining them from their center.

Hegel's example is orbiting bodies, which are in elliptical orbit because the speed of the orbiting planet is greater at perihelion and decreases as it approaches aphelion, so size of orbit is in inverse proportion to the masses of the planets. The speed increases as the planet approaches perihelion, the sun, and decreases as it gets to aphelion, farthest distance away.

This is a “measure” example; the purely quantitative change, velocity, affects a qualitative change (the shape of the orbit), but what is interesting about Hegel’s objection to the putative resolution of the problem of indifference is that he notes something that is difficult to state in purely “logical” terms or conceptual terms, as we have become used to those notions. It is that the putative explanation is not really an *explanation*; or, it is *unsatisfying*. This suggests again something about the purposive nature of the processuality of the development of the *SL*, and that will return as an issue in chapter 7.

Note how he puts the point.

This thus indivisible independent measure is now to be more closely examined. It is immanent in all its determinations and in them it remains in unity with itself and undisturbed by them. But, since the determinacies sublated in it implicitly remain the totality, they emerge in it *groundlessly*. The implicit being of indifference and its existence are thus unconnected [*Das Ansich der Indifferenz und daß ihr Daseyn ist unverbunden*]; the determinacies show up in the indifference in an immediate manner and the indifference is in each of them entirely the same. The difference between them is thus posited at first as sublated, hence as quantitative—for this reason, therefore, not as a *self-repelling*; and the indifference not as *self-determining*, but as having and becoming the determinate being that it has only externally. (21.375, my emphasis)

The “groundlessly” and “not as self-determining” are his ways of introducing the notion that nothing is here really explained. It is not due to anything in the nature of planets, mass, gravity that this happens. So he says,

The bare fact is that in the elliptical movement of the celestial bodies their velocity accelerates as they approach perihelion and decreases as they approach aphelion. The quantitative side of this fact has been accurately established by the untiring diligence of observation and, further, it has been reduced to its simple law and formula. All that is legitimately required of a theory has thus been provided. But it did not seem sufficient to the reflection of the understanding. For the purpose of a so-called explanation of the phenomenon and its law, a centripetal and a centrifugal force have been assumed as the qualitative moments of movement along a curved line. (21.378)

But these forces are just ad hoc inventions that serve as mere placeholders and repetitions of the phenomena themselves, of simply what happens. (Readers of the *Phenomenology* will recognize that this is basically the same problem that occurred there at the end of its chapter 3 with “the inverted world.” And the transition it requires, to self-consciousness, is also a similar move.)²²

And then he makes his point about explanation.

Further, it is evident that it is an alien force which would produce this turnabout, and this means that the sometimes accelerating, sometimes decelerating, velocity of the movement cannot be ascertained or, as it is said, explained from the assumed determination of the very factors which were assumed precisely for the sake of explaining this difference. (21.379)

This leaves us with “absolute indifference” and so the *aporia* of the logic of being.

This all hardly counts as a full commentary, but I hope it is enough to indicate the basic issue at stake in the move to a logic of essence, and so a “two-tiered” conception of reality, and to indicate that these reflections on the logical insufficiency of this model of explicability are taken immediately to have metaphysical implications. What there is cannot have *only* the characteristics allowed by a logic of being. Whatever there is, while it must have sensible qualities and quantitative measure, cannot only be so determined. Attempting to claim this has led to such a “self-sublating” and the introduction of a new form of determination.

22. The general structural analogy in Hegel's distinctions here:

Existence (sense-certainty)

Appearance (Perception)

The Essential Relation (*Kraft*) (Understanding)

6

ESSENCE AS REFLECTED BEING

The Essence Problem

According to Hegel, the Concept is the “ground and the source of all finite determinateness and manifoldness” (*SL* 12.23). With respect to the question of logic as metaphysics, we have interpreted that claim as best understood by comparison with Aristotle’s notion of a formal cause, with the status of the concept understood hylomorphically, not as a separate, metaphysical entity. We have interpreted the progression of the *SL* to involve a growing self-consciousness of pure thinking about itself and its role as “ground and source” of the minimal determinateness without which objects could not intelligibly be what they are. We reach now the most decisive transition in that process.

The idea that we will now investigate—that the world that is directly accessible around us, as it just “seems” to be, makes coherent sense only if it is understood as the expression of what is *not* sensibly accessible, but rather “posited”—has been one of the most persistent and powerful ones in the Western philosophical tradition, and not just in the Western tradition. Versions of the idea range from the claim that nothing directly accessible is at all real, that life is a dream, to views about the lesser “degrees of reality” in what is directly accessible, to views linked to the idea because of a resolute denial of it, insisting that the measure of the real just is what is directly accessible in our experience—that, and nothing more.

The logic of essence is organized into three sections, “Reflection,”

“Appearance,” “Actuality”; and “Actuality” is organized into three sections, “The Absolute,” “Actuality,” “The Absolute Relation.” I aim here for a relatively high-altitude view of this structure, with the intention of mainly interpreting the logic of the essence-appearance relation and why essence is ultimately understood as a kind of relationality. Even this I will do only in a limited way, with respect to our main question about logic and metaphysics.

That claim about a distinction between what is truly real or essential and what appears, or that way of thinking, is now on the *Logic*’s agenda. The major issue throughout has concerned the possibility of *intelligibly determinate actuality*, which Hegel has also characterized as “the universal,” the “in and for itself *Sache*,” the *logos*, “the reason of that which is,” the “value of the matter” (*Wert der Sache*), “the essentialities” (*Wesenheiten*).¹ That is not a question about which things exist or what sorts of things exist. It is an inquiry about the determinations necessary to pick a thing out as what it “actually” is. Our examples in chapter 2 were: A practice exists, and we want to know not merely what happens or whether it exists but whether the practice is *actually* a religious practice. Or a computer wins at chess, but is it actually thinking?² Something is displayed in a gallery, but is it actually art? These are questions the force of which does not depend on the continuing existence of the practice or computer. Our assumption has been that we cannot successfully make sense of objects and events and other persons unless we know how to distinguish such actuality from the unimportant, the ignorable, the accidental or irrelevant.

These questions are just examples. The *Logic* is not concerned with them, and, we should say, is concerned with *actuality as such*, the *possible* actuality of anything intelligible, the concepts or categories presupposed in any specific determination of anything. These example questions—the

1. This will hardly exhaust the synonyms. The last, *Wesenheiten*, indicates the importance of the logic of essence. But Hegel is not terribly precise with these terms. *Wirklichkeit*, actuality, also plays a role in the *Logic* as a modal notion, mostly independent of these categorical/essentialist considerations, where it is invoked as a contrast with possibility and necessity.

2. As in other cases like this, this sort of differentiation is criterial in Hegel’s distinguishing a *Satz* or proposition from an *Urteil* or judgment. Knowing that a carriage passed by or Napoleon lost at Waterloo is the knowledge of *Sätze* and tells us nothing about “actuality.” So a genuine judgment for Hegel is not merely an *asserted* proposition, as it is in the post-Fregean world, although it is important to note that the bearer of truth in Hegel’s account is the judgment. A *genuine* judgment is something recognizable in Aristotle; we want not just knowledge but understanding; what understanding expresses is knowledge of the why, the cause—satisfaction of the principle of sufficient reason. See Lear 1988, 6–7.

actuality of religion, of freedom, of thinking, of art—remain philosophical questions. They will make up what is called Hegel's *Realphilosophie*. But they depend on “the logic of actuality” as such, which simply means: *how* we think about what anything “really is.” As we have seen, the determinations of such conceptuality cannot be empirical; they must be understood, according to Hegel, as “products” of thought's self-determination of itself, a process that continually realizes thought's apperceptive nature. Or: the concept gives itself its own actuality. Hegelian conceptuality has this subjective dimension (“thought's autonomy”),³ even while also being the articulation of the conceptual structure of reality. This has nothing to do with spinning every actual, contingent species-form out of thought's self-examination. The topic, as it will eventually be addressed in this *Logic*, is logical or categorial formality as such, not “what are the existing species-forms?” And the concept of formality as such must “give itself its own actuality,” cannot be empirically derived or empirically justified.

The very title of a “logic of essence” suggests (yet again) immediately the philosopher whom Hegel seemed most to admire, Aristotle,⁴ and we shall see that Hegel will initially formulate the issues as much with Aristotle in mind, especially in the first of the three major sections of this logic, as with modern skeptics and idealists as his targets. But the question as Hegel poses it is very abstract and also takes in Plato, who has his own version of the true actuality of the sensible appearances (the ideas); Spinoza, whose ideas about the relation between substance and its attributes occupy a major section of the *Logic*; Leibniz, who claimed that the appearance of substantial interaction and real relations was mere appearance, to be contrasted with monadic actuality; and Fichte, for whom the actuality of the appearances was a transcendental dimension, the ego's self-positing.

The Aristotelian and initial version of the question at issue will be: having identified what is basic or fundamental to reality, that on which all other manifestations depend but which is itself ontologically independent—the

3. Where “subjectivity” is not “psychology.” Its most general reference is “anyone, any being, thinking anything at all.”

4. Here again as well we see Hegel's divergence from Kant. The logic of essence is clearly the most important transition in the book, the decisive “negation” of a putative logic of being that will itself be negated by and incorporated into a logic of the Concept. Essence is not a Kantian term of art, even though he is occasionally willing to invoke the Scholastic language on substantial form for his own purposes, as with “*forma dat esse rei*” in his 1796 response to J. G. Schlosser, “On a Recent Prominent Tone of Superiority in Philosophy” (Kant 2010). For a discussion of the passage, see Pippin (1982, 10–13).

issue Aristotle called substance, the substrate, the underlying—we will want to know *what* substance or any substance should be said to be, its essence. And Hegel will follow for a while an Aristotelian track, treating essence as a *logos*, a discursive principle of intelligibility, where that *logos* is form, and he will then explore its relation to what form comes paired with: form and essence, form and matter, form and content. He will then turn to the question of what such a determination can explain, make sense of, how it could be thought of as ground.

We should briefly recall the general movement of the *SL* thus far. At first, in the logic of being, we took our bearings from the qualitative manifestations of things. In the simplest sense this means, from how a thing ordinarily looks; what properties does it reliably manifest and how much of it is there and what is the relation (a kind of ratio) between “what properties?” and “how much?”

We found in the logic of being that, according to Hegel, it was not possible to specify a thing’s “actual” being by qualitative and quantitative markers, although we can say a lot about what exists, about what, it turns out, “merely” exists. The conditions of actual determinacy, a conceptual content that specifically determines a this as a “this such,” cannot be satisfied by such means. This was the problem of “indifference” summarized at the end of the previous chapter.⁵ Since Hegel accepts the Aristotelian premise that actually to be is to be a *this-such*, where that means it is identifiable *by* being an instance of a kind, this means we have failed with respect to the question of actuality.⁶ We are thereby compelled, in the prosecution of the original task, to consider that, “actually,” a thing is *not* how it simply appears, looks, sensibly manifests itself, however regular or predictable. We have to say that in some way, what a thing actually is lies hidden, must be uncovered, posited, a product of thought, not simple empirical apprehension as such.

5. As is often the case in the book, this issue, tied to the tricky question of what would count as an adequate understanding, reappears again and again. See the discussion of the issue in the section on Judgment, 12.554ff., and on Mechanism, 12.135ff.

6. Cf. Wiggins 2001:

Essences of natural things, as we have them here, are not fancified vacuities parading themselves in the shadow of familiar things as the ultimate explanation of everything that happens in the world. *They are natures whose possession by their owners is the precondition of their owners being divided from the rest of the reality as anything at all.* These natures are delimited by reference to causal or explanatory principles and purposes that are low level perhaps; but they are fully demanding enough for something to count as their being disappointed or frustrated. (143, my emphasis)

This passage is quoted in Yeomans (2007, 82). He then goes on to point out the relevant differences between Wiggins and Hegel.

What we will need is a comprehension of the difference announced as the very first topic discussed in this *Logic*: the distinction between the “essential” and the “unessential,” and the basis for this differentiation. For this we need to understand first the logical status of the *unessential* or mere seeming, what Hegel refers to as *Schein*. This will be an unusual status, since, while there *are* seemings, seeming is also a kind of nonbeing,⁷ and even essence is thereby proximally and first understood negatively, as what *isn’t* manifest, the negation of mere seeming. But whatever seemings are (in not “actually” being), they *exist* and are *determinate*, a determinacy inexplicable, Hegel claims, by the “skeptics and idealists” who claim that this distinction cannot be made, and therefore say, “everything is illusory” or mere *Schein*. A determination of *what* isn’t a mere seeming, *what* is “shining,” will require an account of the forms of “reflection” and the “essentialities” of reflection, the “laws” of thought, identity, difference, and contradiction.

So one prominent modality of seeming is the constancy of temporal change, a constancy that would amount to chaos, were we not able to identify some permanence underlying such change. This must be done by reflecting, not by apprehending. Such a reflection would be a search for some identity in a way that could account for its differentiated appearing, all by reflecting under various different understandings of reflection, together with a parallel account of how the essential can be said to *be* reflected in its manifestations or seemings. And, as noted before, none of this will be adequate unless essence has in effect some work to do. That work must be making sense of why things are as they are, showing how essence becomes ground, *Grund*. If we *can’t* do this, Hegel says, we end up, to cite one of his examples, with appeals to the underlying essence that explains the appearances of the earth’s orbit around the sun as the “reciprocal attractive force” between them, something that just repeats in effect the facts (11.304). So what it *is* to account for something, to account for its intelligibility, now begins to become itself an ever more explicit topic in the *Logic*, as Hegel lays out what are in effect his interpretations of the various dimensions of the principle of sufficient reason, the most interesting of which in the first section of the logic of essence is what sort of a “ground” (a reason for a thing’s being as it is) a “form” is. With all this in place, essentially the logical principles according to which an account of such a two-tiered account of rationality can be given, the *Logic*

7. The denial of this, typical of common sense and empiricism, is a commitment to what Hegel calls “positivism,” the “unreflective” acceptance of things as they seem (that is, the denial of such seeming).

moves to the accounts of appearance, *Erscheinungen* (which is what *Schein* has become now that we know how it can be grounded),⁸ and the important topics that involve another use of the key term “actuality,” *Wirklichkeit*: Hegel’s understanding of modality.

So the problem that threads through the logic of essence is a straightforward one. If we need some sort of two-tiered conception of reality to explain successful determinacy, how do the two tiers relate to each other? The three sections of this logic are structured by attention to three basic possible answers to such a question.

- (i) Reflected “seeming” or *Schein*,
- (ii) Appearance as such, or *Erscheinung*, the determinate manifesting of essence, and
- (iii) Actuality, which has as its main topic that very issue resolved, explanatory and ontological “relation” itself, *Verhältnis*, and which concentrates on a cause’s relation to, manifestation in, its effect. (As noted, this is, appropriately, the third of Kant’s categorical groupings.)

We begin, that is, with the least determinate version of that relation, mere seeming, unstable *Schein*, and necessary but indeterminate essence. Since we are beginning with the bare (and already “contradictory”) notion of what is not directly manifest in the manifest, Hegel begins with the “essentialities of reflection,” or what sort of thought, reflection, results in such a determination. Predictably, we get into some trouble if we cannot explain *how* the relation between essential and unessential makes sense of anything, and we cannot unless we explore the relation of ground itself (including the most sweeping version, the principle of sufficient reason) and grounded, a topic that leads us into the dialectics of form and its consummation in the concepts of condition, finally unconditioned condition.

The upshot of this analysis is a grounded manifestation or “appearance,” where what is essential to such appearance’s determinacy is not hidden or behind it but, as R. G. R. Mure rightly says, “on a level” with it.⁹ The concept of form has been rethought as the explanatory notion of law, and the explanatory notion of law is understood in terms of such relations as whole/parts, force and its expression, inner/outer.

8. For Hegel’s explanation of the difference, see EL §131.

9. Mure 1940.

Overcoming, by understanding the nature of the relation between, all these dualisms and so overcoming a continuing gap between *explicans* and *explicandum* is the project of “Actuality,” a topic that brings the objective logic to a close. Now the relation problem is discussed in terms of Spinoza’s substance, or whole, and its attributes and modes, Leibniz’s monads, the actual’s relation to the possible and the necessary, and finally the most authoritative modern understanding of ground and grounded, cause and effect, a discussion that ends with reciprocal cause and effect as the transition to the logic of the concept.

So we are presented with a string of topics building on the same problem inherited from the logic of being—the reflective determination of identity within or underlying manifest differences, ground-grounded, form-matter complex, condition-conditioned, force and its expression, inner-outer, substance-attribute, possibility-actuality, cause-effect, reciprocal causality. So much for the road map.

Schein

The basic, initial idea in this *Logic*, the idea of an “essence,” the knowability of which requires an act of “reflection,” is a familiar and a wide-ranging one. An analogy (a rough one!) would be an approach to a literary text. Someone who had understood everything said onstage, the plot of Shakespeare’s *King Lear*, and the basic motivations of the characters, as those characters and others voice them, and had understood *only* that, would not, we feel entitled to say, have understood “the play.”¹⁰ Put in the simplest possible way, to understand the play, one has to do more than listen to it; one must *think* about it, or we can say, using the word most important for Hegel, “reflect” on it, understand what lies “beneath,” we are also wont to say, these facts about plot and characters.¹¹ In the EL §112Z, he introduces reflection as simply “thinking something over” (*nachdenken*) and he connects the reflective search for essences as broadly the task of philosophy itself, a way of looking behind what he calls a mere “rind” or a “curtain,” so as to see essence (or, as

10. Cf. Hegel’s remarks about the “content” of *Romeo and Juliet*, EL §133Z.

11. We are not far enough along yet to be able to understand his argument for why being able to do this requires us to understand “of what kind” it is an “instance of,” or why knowing something like “it is an instance of ‘avoidance of love’ treatments” does not at all thereby deny its specific genius, but makes possible the proper reflection on it. But that is the ultimate goal (with the concrete universal of the logic of the Concept).

above, what is truly actual), where it lies “hidden” (*verborgen*).¹² (These are only initial, orienting metaphors of course. There is no such *thing* as a hidden meaning in *King Lear*; there *are* just the words spoken or found on the page. How we get from this clumsy metaphor to the “concept” of *King Lear* in itself is the underlying story of the logic of essence.)

An even more intuitive example is another used to illustrate the same point in the EL §112Z, the relation between a person’s character, “essence” in that sense, and her deeds. It would be a mistake to sum a person up, attempt to “understand” her in the distinct way persons should be understood, simply by adding up or listing everything she did, from what she had for breakfast to her volunteering for a dangerous mission. A person would not be properly understood by attention to such “immediacy” alone (or her qualitative/quantitative/measured appearances, as in the logic of being). We need to understand her deeds as “mediated” by what Hegel calls her “inwardness” (*sein Inneres*), something (and now in the most important difference with the logic of being) that we cannot see, that does not simply present itself.

For example, we can’t really understand what she did except by some attention to her own formulation of the act description and to her avowed motive (her “intention”). Sometimes what happens should not count as a deed because there is not the proper connection between inner and outer. An accident happens. Something prevents her from realizing the intention; that is, something happens to her. She does not do something.¹³ What happens is not an expression of her character. On the other hand, as Hegel states the central claim of the entire logic of essence in a phrase, we must concede that any such inner self-construal can “prove itself” (*sich bewähren*) only in what

12. The artistic example is not incidental. The “logic” or dialectical relation of appearance and what appears is central to the type of explanation Hegel wants to give to the meaning of fine art. Consider this passage from his *Lectures on Fine Art*, especially the dialectical play of *Schein* being *wesentlich* for *Wesen*:

So far as concerns the unworthiness of the element of art in general, namely its pure appearance [*Schein*] and deceptions, this objection would of course have its justification if pure appearance could be claimed as something wrong. But appearance itself is essential to essence [*Doch der Schein selbst ist dem Wesen wesentlich*]. (A8)

See also Pippin (2013a, chap. 2) for more on what this entails.

13. So one can say that this transition from the logic of being to the logic of essence mirrors or even grounds the idea in Hegel’s *Philosophy of Right* that the “external” relations of abstract right must be mediated by attention to a person’s “inner” life or mindedness just for these external relations to be coherent. Abstract right must be rethought in terms of the category of morality. Relations within abstract right are merely external, do not depend on reference to anything inner. This transition mirrors, we should say, the transition from a logic of being to a logic of essence.

manifests that inner outwardly, in the deeds. (It is immediately important to note that this “test” can fail.) Too radical a separation and we have someone trying to disown what she in fact did, to fabricate excuses. (“Mistakes were made”; “It was never my intention to deceive/hurt/offend anyone,” etc.) We need this distinction, but we can’t establish *which* deeds are true manifestations of essence and which are mere aberrations by any statistical analysis of frequency, any simple inspection of what happens. We need to understand *how* “what shows,” “what manifests itself” (*Schein*), can be said to reflect these deeds’ essence when it does (if it does, then as *Erscheinung*, appearance), even if, as appearance, no *one* deed is ever a manifestation or simple representation of essence as such.¹⁴

Understanding this relation properly is what Hegel thinks allows him to speak of a mediated immediacy. The appearances are not denied as unreal. They “shine” in their immediacy. But they can be understood in their determinate immediacy only as the manifestation of the thing that they are appearances of, and so as always already mediated. Occasionally, of course, we do not know what they are appearances of, but we do know that they are appearances in that sense, and so that there is something to be found. That is already a mediated immediacy. (Granted, Hegel puts this in a confusing way: “immediacy is rather just this movement itself” [11.250].) We can’t *derive* the appearances from a mediated (“posited,” “reflected,” “thought-over”) essence. That would be a denial of their immediacy. But we don’t apprehend such appearances on their own, in pure immediacy, and then infer what appears. What appears is appearing in what manifests itself, even if at some moment, it = X. What a person does is tied to that person’s character, whatever it is. And understanding that character is nothing other than rightly understanding what that person has done. With respect to all the reflected dualisms introduced in the logic of essence, this thought in various forms remains the kernel of that logic throughout.¹⁵

14. This could all be understood in the way that looking at the “reflection” of something in a mirror could seem to be looking at something “less real” than the thing itself; but if, say, that allowed us to observe a person when he thought he was unobserved, the reflection would tell us more than the presentation of the subject himself.

15. This is only an initial summary. Sometimes the difference between *Schein* and *Erscheinung* can be quite complicated. A sophist, for example, is not a philosopher in a way different from the sense in which a tradesman or a statesman is not a philosopher. He is a false, a seeming philosopher, *Schein*, not the appearance (*Erscheinung*) of a philosopher in the way Socrates’s activities and questions are the manifestation of a philosopher. This is why Hegel says that mere *Sein* is only *Schein*, illusory being, “being’s nothingness,” and so “the negative posited as negative” (11.246) or: “*Being* is as such only the *becoming* of essence” (11.317).

It is summarized in various ways. For example:

Thus essence appears. Reflection is the internal shining of essence. (11.323)

The task is to demonstrate that the determinations which distinguish it [*Schein*] from essence are the determinations of essence itself. (11.247)

(If we can, we have *Erscheinung*.) This is also why essence is a retrospective reflection of *what has been made manifest*, why it is rooted in *gewesen*, the past participle of *sein* or “what has been,” a feature somewhat counterintuitive in an account of action.¹⁶ It is also why Hegel is happy to accept the *Wesen/gewesen* suggestion of temporality. It links his account with one he admired, Aristotle’s, whose term for what is often translated as essence is *to ti ēn einai*, something like “the what it was to be” of a thing. (Although Hegel qualifies this figurative use of temporality: “The German language has kept ‘essence’ [*Wesen*] in the past participle [*gewesen*] of the verb ‘to be’ [*sein*], for essence is past — *but timelessly past* — being” [11.241, my emphasis].) Ultimately on Hegel’s account, if we want to know whether this lie reveals a person to be a “liar,” what we need is not to have deeper insight into some thinglike essence, but to observe what else the person does over time and to understand the *relation* among these deeds, to interpret them or “think them over” in their relation to each other. This will be a crucial point throughout the logic of essence, and it obviously raises the question of how to make, what guides us in making, this relational connection.

Finally, it is important to stress that this topic is being introduced very broadly. No particular theory of “essentialism” is being entertained, and as already noted, making the general distinction just discussed could be achieved even by an account of the difference between transcendental and empirical subjectivity, or between categories and empirical concepts.

The Essence Paradox

This, then, is the problem, but it is propelled onward at the outset by a continuing paradox or tension that first arises in a passage on diversity (*Verschiedenheit*). The paradox is this: Determinate specification of something

16. However counterintuitive, it lies at the center of everything Hegel wants to say about human agency. See Pippin (2008) for a defense of this claim.

essential in an appearance requires essential predication or specification of some sort — some predicates, not others. But we know *which* predicates *are* essential only by *already* knowing what essence is.¹⁷ This is a problem that assumes different forms but is basically the same, whether posed in the language of classical essentialism and manifestations, or selecting from a large set of “grounding” casual factors the genuinely explanatory one or ones.

It is also a problem that can be posed in terms of the Aristotelian notion of actuality that I have been suggesting helps illuminate Hegel on *Wirklichkeit*. For if an object’s intelligibility is primarily a matter of its substantial form, and if that form is to be understood as the distinct being-at-work of the thing, its distinct realization of itself, then this has obvious implications for epistemology. We can be said to know the “what it was to be” of a thing, neither by a direct intellectual intuition (its being-at-work is a process, a way of being, not graspable punctually as itself some object) nor by just observing, say, the life of a living thing or the uses of an artifact. We would already have to be able to distinguish essential from inessential in order to track the relevant “realizations.”¹⁸

Later, when Hegel is discussing that dialectical relation between ground and grounded, he expands the same paradox or tension, inherited from the general problem of fixing the determinacy of essence. This is because, if essence is to explain anything, it must be the ground of what immediately “shines” or appears. Those seemings must be *its own*, and they are made sense of by reference to their essence.

On the one hand, the ground is ground as the immanently reflected content determination of the determinate being [*Dasein*] which it grounds; on the other hand, it is that which is posited. *It is that on the basis of which that*

17. There is a good explanation of this as a problem in Aristotle (one that also involves difficulties with Aristotle’s account of intuition and discursivity) in Mure (1940, 34). Mure’s statement of Aristotle’s “idealism” is also a good summary of issues in Hegel: Nature, he says, “is something which is only actual as the object and content of mind. Nature and mind are not merely concurrent in their development; their single actualization has its seat in mind.” And thus “the formal cause of Nature is mind” (39).

18. See Pippin 2008, chap. 6. We are also with such examples introduced to the major logical problem in the logic of essence: a substrate or essence can be identified determinately only by its appearances; but we know which appearances are genuine manifestations of essence and which incidental only if we already have identified essence and can make use of that identification in such separation. Besides Mure’s treatment, Yeomans (2012, 88–92) draws our attention to issues in the philosophy of science that helpfully highlight the same problem.

determinate being [Dasein] is supposed to be understood; but, conversely, it is inferred from the latter and is understood from it. The main business of this reflection thus consists in gleaning the ground from a determinate being [Dasein], that is, in converting the immediate determinate being [Dasein] into the form of reflected being; consequently the ground, instead of being self-subsisting in and for itself, is rather that which is posited and derived. (11.305, my emphasis)

That is—and here the great difficulty in this *Logic* begins (and Hegel also, as above, admits again in EL§ 114 that it is the most difficult section of the *Logic*)¹⁹—it is also the case that the “not” in “its actuality is *not* how it merely seems” is not an “indeterminate” not, wholly unrelated to what it actually is, as it would be in a negation like “that dog is not an electrical charge,” or “protons are not residents of Cleveland.” In some sense, and it is the task of a logic of essence to explain in what sense, the thing’s actuality is both not its own mere seemings, and yet nothing other than those seemings, *rightly understood*. (Cf. the example of deeds and character above.) As Hegel will say, these seemings are “essence’s own,” even if not direct or immediate manifestation of its actuality in the way a photograph is a representation of and so an appearance of its subject. A person looks different and acts, reacts, speaks differently at different stages of her life. Each of these stages is how she seems, even though she remains “essentially” the same person, and no such stage better or correctly captures her essence. No such stage is a partial or distorted appearance of, representation of, that same person. In the philosophical tradition, the standard way to say that she remains the same person is to say that she has retained the same form, with various different contents at different times, and Hegel, like Aristotle, speaks of that form as “being at work” (*energeia*, *Tätigkeit*, *Wirklichkeit*) in keeping heterogeneous, different manifestations part of the same unity, which makes possible our making sense of holding together the differing manifestations as all of the same person. This is how Hegel explains the unique character of form’s dynamic activity:

Essence is reflection, *the movement of becoming and transition that remains within itself*, wherein that which is distinguished is determined simply and solely as the negative in itself, as shine. (11.249, my emphasis)

19. Apparently so difficult that he did not even try to summarize these sections for his students in the *Encyclopedia*.

This is of course a successor to the logic of being's own two-sided or dialectical concept of negation. There it was a matter of a thing's excluding, *not being* its contrary, but also *being determinable as what it actually is* just by such exclusion. There are many other issues attending the traditional notion of a substrate, or even substance, but these will appear later in Hegel's account. He is mostly interested here in the "shine" or "seeming" of what is not available except as so "shown" and how we are to understand some underlying unity or sameness, "identity," throughout qualitative change, where such alterations are understood as these "seemings."²⁰

Moreover, Hegel is still treating the "logic" of essence-seeming distinctions *very* generally. Indeed, his treatment is so general that the procedure now is also an implicit exhibition of the method of the *Logic* itself. Essence, *Wesen*, is a reflection on *Sein* itself (a recollection and recovery of its inadequate moments). Being, *Sein*, can now be understood as a "founded" phenomenon, and the mere seeming, the *Schein*, of its purported undetermined immediacy can be exposed by understanding *Wesen* as "reflected Being." Or the *logic of being* is an extended demonstration of the insufficiency of such a logic and its "going to the ground" in essence. So when Hegel introduces us to "seeming" (*Schein*), he says:

Being is *Schein*. The being of *Schein* consists solely in the sublatedness of being, in being's nothingness; this nothingness it has in essence, and apart from its nothingness, apart from essence, it does not exist. It is the negative posited as negative.

Schein is all that remains of the sphere of Being. (11.246)

He is in effect saying that a putative *logic of being* is, has shown itself to be, mere seeming, *Schein*. As Theunissen points out, this means that Hegel is actually invoking the notion of *Schein* in three different senses. There is the unacknowledged *Schein* that a logic of being has turned out to be. There is the *Schein* of the mere appearances that the skeptic and idealists claim are all we are able to know. And there is the result of the analysis, that this purported limitation of knowledge to mere *Schein* is itself *Schein*, unable to account for itself; what seemed mere *Schein* turns out to be the *Schein of essence* or *Erscheinung*.²¹

20. See the discussion by Yeomans (2007) on this issue.

21. Theunissen 1980, 336–38.

In other words, the *illusion* of any possible absolute presuppositionlessness is what has been demonstrated by showing that *Sein* must be understood as *Wesen*, just in order to be understood as *Sein*.²² (“*Being* is as such only the *becoming* of essence” [11.317]) Or, *Sein* is now revealed as the failed presumption of a possible independent and immediate intuitional moment, now considered “logically”; *Wesen* will show itself (and itself as the truth of *Sein*) as always already conceptually mediated determinacy.²³

The Logic of Reflection

So there are seemings and there is essence. We can say that the concept of these “seemings”²⁴ is what a reflection-conception requires, but as “immediate,” as what just presents itself, the accessible manifestations of something *not* manifest. Essence itself is also “reflection” (and so knowable only as reflected), but obviously in that one-sidedly still “objective” sense just discussed. (As if what is needed to understand such a reflection of essence is somehow observational, intuitive, passive. It isn’t.)

Hegel says reflection is “the movement of becoming and transition that remains within itself” (11.249). This is an introduction to the contrast mentioned above between the status of negation in both the SL and the EL. Essence’s seemings are *its own* (“remains within itself”), not something other than, qualitatively different from, another thing, as in the logic of being, even though no seeming or set of appearances express in their immediacy what that essence actually is.²⁵ This contrast is clear in this passage.

22. See an earlier passage in Theunissen’s (1980, 104–5) indispensable discussion.

23. In Hegel’s words:

In being, when taken in that simplicity and immediacy, the memory that it is the result of a perfect abstraction, and that it is therefore already abstract negativity, nothing, is left back behind the science which, starting explicitly from essence, will exhibit that one-sided immediacy as a mediated immediacy where being is posited as concrete existence, and that which mediates being, the ground, is also posited. (21.86)

24. One can certainly understand what di Giovanni is trying to do and to avoid by translating *Schein* as simply “shine,” but that term is so associated with sensibility and various irrelevancies (like “glowing” or brightness) that he seems to me to take on as many problems as he avoids. “Seemings” can mean the sensible looks of things in Plato, a feature of their ontological status, as well as subject-dependent mental states in Descartes or Locke or Hume. Hegel’s account at this point is that abstract. Yeomans’s (2007) translation of *Schein* as “guise” is helpful.

25. Although it is misleadingly easy at points in the *Logic* to identify Hegel’s position with Leibniz’s, this emphasis on the “internal” source of differentiation is a point of genuine similarity.

In the becoming of being, it is being which lies at the foundation of determinateness, and *determinateness is reference to an other*. Reflective movement is by contrast the other as *negation in itself*, a negation which has being only as self-referring [*sich beziehende*]. (Ibid., my emphasis)

Plato, Kant, Locke, Spinoza, and others can all be cited in various ways as expressive of the reflective logic of the appearances of essence, the manifestation of something substantial that is nevertheless not manifest as it is in itself. To understand how this is possible, Hegel argues that it has become necessary to understand the content of and relation among the “determinations of reflection” by means of which essences can be established (qualitative identities fixed and differentiated from others) and a proper relation to appearances established: “identity, difference, and contradiction.” Such examples are still relevant, but I would like to introduce a discussion of these determinations by returning to an example suggested in chapter 3. In keeping with an orientation from, but by no means an identification with, the Kantian origins of some of these problems, we can see that the relation between identity (or the kind of unity that makes any identification possible) and difference (or the manifold, the elements of any manifold considered apart from any unity) is congruent with the Kantian Ur-distinction between concept (the principle of unity and so identification) and intuition (the principle and source of differentiation). Kant simply assumes this gap (on the standard account of Kant, at any rate), and so his philosophy has no chance to be systematic. It relies on what seems a psychological claim about human nature. It would be wrong to say that Hegel will “*derive* difference from identity” (just as it would be wrong to make either identity or differentiation, affirmation or negation, superordinate to the other and then attempt a derivation), for all the reasons explored in chapter 4. This is basically a deductive model of systematicity and it is not Hegel’s.

There is a moment near the end of his exploration of the first determination, identity, that reveals how he takes himself to be arguing. He is working against the idea that the principle of identity can be understood as “abstract identity,” as articulated simply by “ $A = A$,” “a tree is a tree,” “God is God.” He argues that A can be understood in its self-identity only *determinately*, and that means by something not- A , and the context makes clear that he

Leibniz’s unique principle of *appetitus* or point of view in each monad remains for Hegel an empty notion, never really developed by Leibniz, but it is the right idea.

means, not the mere repetition of A itself as that determination, but determinate predicates that, we would say, do not mean the same thing as A. So not “human being is human being,” but something like “human being is rational animal,” where “rational animal” is not (and here the quotation marks matter) “human being” again (has a different meaning, *Sinn*). (There is no indication that Hegel thinks that by such essential and determinate predication we have said that $A = \sim A$ and have embraced contradiction by confusing the “is of identity” with the “is of predication.” It is determinate—if also essential—*predication* throughout.) We have not derived “difference” in this sense from “identity,” but the exposition has shown that identification (*identity at work*, one should say) requires already, in itself, just by being thought through, an appeal to *differentiating factors*. Otherwise nothing is determinately identified. His language is:

No justification is normally given for how the form of negation by which this principle is distinguished from the other comes to identity.—But this form is implied by the pure movement of reflection which identity is, by the simple negativity which is contained in a more developed form by the just stated second formulation of the principle. A is enunciated, and a not-A which is the pure other of A; but this not-A only shows itself in order to disappear. In this proposition, therefore, identity is expressed as a negation of negation. (11.265)

Again, the not-A invoked here is explicitly to be in contrast with identity formulated as the repetition of A, and refers to predicative differentiation. But it is essential predication, not accidental. “It shows itself in order to disappear.” In showing human to be rational animal, the subject term, as he sometimes says, is *wholly* “covered” by the predicate term. *Having* understood the essential predication, we understand that this not-A, these predicates, are just (now differentiated) A again. They “disappear” as alien or accidental predicates.

So it is possible to show something like the equiprimordiality or co-dependence of identity (identification) and difference (differentiation), but it is also possible to understand how someone like Fichte might have thought in terms of such superordination. And this in the following way.

As noted in chapter 2, the synthetic unity of apperception unqualifiedly necessary for intending any content amounts to what Hegel wants to call “the unity of the concept,” which itself constitutes the representation of an object,

given that an object is “that in the concept of which the manifold is united.” I maintain that, considered independently of Hegel’s critique of Kant’s strict separation of understanding and sensibility, this is the link between apperceptive unity and the relation between concept and object that Hegel himself adopts in the passages where he praises Kant for having discovered the “unity of the concept” as what it is to be an object, to have *that* unity. That is the point of the laudation. But if one looks at this as Fichte did, one could say something like: the self’s presence to itself throughout all its experiences (or in Fichte, the I’s positing of itself) could be seen as the ground of the possibility of the self’s relation to an object (in the sense of: the I’s positing the not-I, and itself as in opposition to the not-I). This is at least the kind of intimate interdependence that Hegel explores in this section, often in ways that have a Fichtean dimension. But what he does not do is treat the I’s self-positing (apperception) as the superordinate principle from which the relation to the not-I is to be *deduced*. (This required that the *nicht-Ich* be in some sense posited by the *Ich*, and that meant that it is actually *not* [*nicht*] the *nicht-Ich* [but the *Ich*-posited-*nicht-Ich*], accounting for some of the paradoxical invocations of negation in Hegel’s discussion.) That passage quoted earlier expresses his own sense of equiprimordiality, or mutual interdeducibility, we could say. “*The pure movement of reflection which identity is*” (identity understood actively as the power to successfully identify) is to be understood by reference to “*the simple negativity which is contained in a more developed form by the just stated second formulation of the principle*” (A’s being A by *already* not being ~A, such that the determinate predicates by which A is specified actually do specify it).²⁶

The Varieties of Reflection

Especially when looked at in terms of its Kantian background, this elusive thought is the most important in the *Logic*. The issue in the logic of being concerned the misleading appearance of a presuppositionless beginning with the concept “being,” and by contrast the true beginning of the logic in the discovery of the inseparability of affirmation and negation, “becoming” in Hegel’s language. This “master thought” in some sense refers all at once to

26. This is made explicit in EL §116 and in the addition, where Hegel says that the question of how we derive distinction from identity (or vice versa) is an “unthinking” question that basically makes no sense. This seems to me a rejection of “autonomous negation” as Henrich understands it.

the co-definability of qualitative independence and dependence (substance independence and relational dependence)²⁷ in the logic of being; the identity within difference of essence and appearance, and so ultimately of ground and what is grounded in the logic of essence; and the way in which Hegel wants to understand the concrete universal, that is, the inseparability of particular and universal in the logic of the Concept. (That is, not at all as a reductive attempt to argue for the absoluteness of conceptual intelligibility, as if particularity must be a matter of qualitative conceptuality, as in the traditional criticism of Hegel.) All of these formulations amount to Hegel's attempt to think through the implications of the distinguishability yet inseparability of what Kant distinguished as concept and intuition and Kant's attempt to strictly separate transcendental aesthetic from transcendental logic from transcendental dialectic, or the "logics" of sensibility, understanding, and reason. One could also say that whereas in Kant, experiential intelligibility seems modeled on some sort of a two-step process—the sheer deliverances of sensibility, and then the imposition of conceptual unity—in Hegel's contrasting account, these two components, and all their avatars in the list above, are both in a way dual and in a way one. Finding a way to state properly the mutual implicability of some way of understanding differentiability and identification, the diversity of required predication, and the (paradoxically independent) unity without which these would be nearly diverse amounts to the great struggle in all of the *Logic* and is leading us toward the famous statement at 11.286 that "All things are in themselves contradictory."²⁸ (Hegel's suggestion that Kant's concept-intuition distinction should be understood as primarily a logical or conceptual problem, that we do not yet know how to think together their inseparability with their distinctness, reaches its most crucial turning point in the logic of essence in his account of reflection. The "immediacy" of *Schein* as nevertheless also mediated, determinate even when the skeptic insists on the absence of a determining essence, is a pivot of the book, why it is so important for commentators like Henrich and Theunissen. The resolution of

27. Expressed in Kantian language, this would be the relation between noumenal, substantial independence and the wholly relational character of phenomena (understood materially, for example, as nothing but relations of forces of attraction and repulsion). This was supposed to be resolved by ratios of quality and quantity in measure, but no way was found to stabilize determinate relations. This was the problem Hegel called "indifference."

28. More generally, Hegel altered the terms of the debate much more than Fichte and Schelling, insisting that at bottom this is a *problem of logic* and cannot be properly understood within the self-understanding of finite thinking, or *Verstand*. (Both Fichte and Schelling remain for Hegel within, even while stretching to its boundaries, *Verstand*.)

the book will then have one of its many names: the problem of “absolute reflection.”)

How this equipoise between the distinct, determinate, and various moments of *Schein* and the identical essence that “shines” through such appearances is to be understood is now treated by Hegel as involving three different possibilities of reflective determination, all of which turn out to be linked, none of which is self-sufficient. If we think of the account in terms of our example of the relation between a person’s character/essence and her particular deeds, then, since all we “immediately” are presented with are the actual deeds, the character or essence must be in some way “posited” (rather than apprehended or seen). But the positing cannot be arbitrary; what guides our positing is what we think the deeds must “presuppose” to be the deeds they are. A person is scrupulous about promise-keeping and avoiding malicious gossip, yet on one occasion he reveals a deep confidence he promised not to reveal, and that greatly damages another’s reputation. Does such a deed have to presuppose “the type of person who would do that,” perhaps constrained in the past only by simply having no interest in the confidences or the person (or never having had the right opportunity before)? Or is the deed an aberration for which extenuating circumstances can be found, such that no presupposition of such a type would be warranted? If we don’t know how to connect in any determinate way the deed with the inward character being manifested (or not), then our positing/presupposing reflection is just a form of “external” reflection. This externality, though, is crucial; it is the source of whatever determinate positing is possible. That is, the external deed is *some* sort of manifestation of not keeping faith with an avowed commitment; that much can be presupposed. But what “that much” means, with only that external link, remains indeterminate. Even if the person never does such a thing again, we still won’t be able to determine what she, “being who she is,” would do on the right occasion. He could be virtuous by dint of good luck, of never finding himself in a situation where revealing a confidence would benefit or in some other way tempt him.

It can be made more determinate if we can exercise “determining reflection.” Before introducing that mode of reflection, Hegel, in a remark, notes Kant’s distinction in the *Critique of the Power of Judgment* between determining and reflective judgment. The latter is of the type just discussed; we are given a particular, a specific deed, and we seek reflectively the universal it instantiates, in this case what is essentially true of a person across her various deeds—her type. (This is not the kind of example Kant gives. He is often

more interested in the comparison and abstraction of empirical concept formation. But the point is the same.) As we saw in chapter 5, Hegel implies that the way Kant has described the situation—given a particular, find the universal—is misleadingly “external.” For what we are supposed to “ascend to” and discover is not really external to the instance being reflected on. It is, he says, it must already be, “its true being” (*eigentliches Seyn*) in the first place. And so we have another example of a distinctness that is also inseparable: the determining judgment—the supposed application of a universal to a particular—strictly separate from reflective judgment, understood as “given a particular, find the universal.” There is no credible way to understand the particular as “external” to the power of reflection like this. As we noted in the previous chapter, as “waiting” for its universal, it isn’t anything determinate at all; as provoking a universal-search, on the assumption that it has not been classified as a kind, it has nothing determinate to guide or direct such a search. It could be said to have scores of properties. Which are relevant? What Hegel calls “reflection in general” must rather be characterized as “determining reflection,” a term he wants to cover both determining and reflective judgment. This is to be understood, in his terms, as the unity of positing and external reflection. What is external, say, the deeds in our example, are not just uniform repetitions of the self-same essence; they are all other than essence, and so “are not” that essence, and so in that sense are its negative. And so they must be, if what is posited as essence is to be concrete, determinate. But what is so posited cannot be merely posited, but must be determinately linked to appearances of such an essence, not mere semblances, with no bearing on it.²⁹ To be able to do this we need to have the notion of ground, and so to understand the relation between ground and what it grounds. What exactly is the relation between subjectively avowed principles—“who I take myself actually to be”—or my self-expressed intentions and what they ground, external bodily movements?

This thought actually parallels one of Kant’s points, or at least follows the same logic. It is sometimes made in terms of Kant’s abstract separation between “analysis,” his term for the abstraction from intuitions, reflection on common markers, which yields an “analytic universal,” and “synthesis,” what

29. Hegel says that essence’s existence is “positedness.” What we are immediately presented with are not just other than appearances, modally excluding the contraries of essence. These reveal something, are the self-reflection of essence, essence’s posittings. But not with total transparency. So positedness is said to be a kind of “mean” between mere existence as in the logic of being and pure essence, what is sought in the logic of essence.

any analysis presupposes since any identified content already, as determinate, involves a number of concepts synthetically. The two activities presuppose one another, in a clear manifestation of Hegelian dialectic. It is also expressed as the relation between an “analytic unity of apperception” and a “synthetic unity of apperception.” The claim is that any analytic unity of apperception, recognizing a commonality in diversity, red in several different red things, presupposes a synthetic unity, the unification of a diversity in the first place, the synthetic bringing together of (only) red objects. So Kant says:

Therefore it is only because I can combine a manifold of given representations in one consciousness that it is possible for me to represent the identity of the consciousness in these representations itself, i.e., the analytical unity of apperception is only possible under the presupposition of some synthetic one. The thought that these representations given in intuition all together belong to me means, accordingly, the same as that I unite them in a self-consciousness, or at least can unite them therein, and although it is itself not yet the consciousness of the synthesis of the representations, it still presupposes the possibility of the latter, i.e., only because I can comprehend the manifold in a consciousness do I call them all together my representations; for otherwise I would have as multicolored, diverse a self as I have representations of which I am conscious. (*CPR* B134)

But it would seem just as true that I can combine the manifold in a self-consciousness only if the manifold is perceived as combinable, that I can “combine a manifold of given representations in one consciousness” only because I have already been able to detect an “identity of consciousness in these representations.” Or the synthetic unity of apperception is also possible only on the presupposition of an analytic one. Yet again we encounter a mutually presupposing relation, here in “determinate reflection.”

This is all an example of what has been characterized here as the core thought in the logic of essence. Hegel’s way of putting the thought should now seem at least recognizable in terms of the above formulations.

Reflection thus finds an immediate before it which it transcends and from which it is the turning back. But this turning back is only the presupposing of what was antecedently found. (*SL* 11.252)

And,

This antecedent comes to be only by being left behind; its immediacy is sublated immediacy. — The sublated immediacy is, contrariwise, the turning back into itself, essence that arrives at itself, simple being equal to itself. This arriving at itself is thus the sublating of itself and self-repelling, presupposing reflection, and its repelling of itself from itself is the arriving at itself. (11.252)

He continues in passages like this to suggest that the key to understanding the concept of a mediated immediacy is to think of that relation as sustained by a kind of “movement,” or even “oscillation,” a movement in which the poles are linked together, not distinct punctual entities. Recall: Essence is reflection, “*the movement of becoming and transition that remains within itself*” (11.249, my emphasis). An even clearer passage:

Essence as such is one with its reflection, inseparable from its movement. It is not essence, therefore, through which this movement runs its reflective course; nor is essence that from which the movement begins, as from a starting point. It is this circumstance that above all makes the exposition of reflection especially difficult, for strictly speaking one cannot say that essence returns into itself, that essence shines in itself, for essence is neither before its movement nor in the movement: this movement has no substrate on which it runs its course. (11.295)³⁰

Having set the issue out in Kantian terms, Hegel is also interested in distinguishing himself from Kant.

But at issue here is neither the reflection of consciousness [Kant’s problem, or so Hegel thinks], nor the more specific reflection of the understanding that has the particular and the universal for its determinations, but reflection in general. It is clear that the reflection to which Kant assigns the search of the universal for a given particular is likewise only an external reflection which applies itself to the immediate as to something given. But

30. Or:

One cannot therefore ask, how form comes to essence, for form is only the internal reflective shining of essence, its own reflection inhabiting it. Form equally is, within it, the reflection turning back into itself or the identical essence; in its determining, form makes the determination into positedness as positedness. (11.296)

the concept of absolute reflection, too, is implicit in it. For the universal, the principle or the rule and law, to which reflection rises in its process of determination is taken to be the essence of the immediate from which the reflection began; the immediate, therefore, to be a nothingness which is posited in its true being only by the turning back of the reflection from it, by the determining of reflection. Therefore, what reflection does to the immediate, and the determinations that derive from it, is not anything external to it but is rather its true being. (11.254–55)

On the Principle of Sufficient Reason

In general, this means nothing but this: Anything which is, is to be considered to exist not as an immediate, but as a posited; there is no stopping at immediate determinate being [*Dasein*] but a return must rather be made from it back into its ground, and in this reflection it is a sublated being and is in and for itself. What is expressed by the principle of sufficient reason is, therefore, the essentiality of immanent reflection as against mere being. (SL 11.293)

I have already indicated what some would call a somewhat deflationary reading of such a determination of reflection (at least as compared with the conventional interpretations). We can see why that reading applies here too by noting what Hegel has to say about Leibniz's identity of indiscernibles, which he introduces in a remark.

He starts by noting that one form of the principle "No two things are alike" is "superfluous" or trivial. It is merely repeating emphatically that two things must be *two* things. The more ambitious principle is Leibniz's: there *cannot be two* things that are *completely* alike, share each and every property. Since for Leibniz even spatial differentiation is relational, and relational properties are in truth monadic (monads are in no real relation to others, are windowless), if two monads had, as the complete expression of all their determinations, everything alike, they could not be two. On that assumption about the relationality of space and the monadic quality of substance, they would share the same spatial location, and could not be two things. Since Leibniz conceives monads atomistically, what he needs is some differentiating factor *in* monadic expression, lest he beg his own question and just assume the impossibility of identical qualitative predicates. He must, rather, explain it. That involves his notion of monadic point of view or particular

appetition in expression.³¹ This is not important for the point Hegel is trying to make, because Leibniz cannot show (according to Hegel) how that assumption serves *to account for* (or, in the general sense we have been tracking, make any sense of) the distinct predicates that result from it. In Leibniz's world, these determinations just seem to "bubble up" from their mysterious source.³² We are back to the problem of the "internal reflection" of essence as ground, and the distinct determinations that it grounds. Here this in effect means that Hegel's position is not that Leibniz is either right or wrong but that the question posed rests on a confusion and so is misleading. This is because the "principles" of identification and differentiation are deeply intertwined, not independent of each other. We have no access to some set of determinations except as already ascribable to a substrate identified as what it distinctly (or essentially) is. That is (and is only) what makes them a proper set. And we have no access to such a substrate except by the specification of its "determinate" differentiae.³³ Realizing this is supposed to be the resolution of the essence paradox introduced above in section 3.

Hegel remarks that this too all sounds as strange to ordinary reflection as the first superfluous version. We assume diversity starting out, unlikeness within some likeness, and also assume that "the determination of unlikeness pertains to all things." But as above, we have to show *how* the expression of a thing in its properties (in its "seemings" or *Schein*) serves to differentiate it as the unique expression of those determinations.

It is the ordinary norm of cognition itself to require a demonstration for linking diverse determinations together into one synthetic proposition, or to indicate some third term in which such determinations are mediated. Such a demonstration would have to display the transition from identity to diversity, and the transition then from diversity to determinate diversity, to unlikeness. (11.271)

31. Leibniz 1989, 215, and §15. For Hegel's understanding of the issue, see 20.252–53. And see Southgate 2014.

32. *SL* 11.247. Di Giovanni translates *Blasen* as "froth."

33. This is what he means in the *EL* §116:

Essence is pure identity, and inward shine only because it is negativity relating itself to itself, and hence by being self-repulsion [*Abstoßen*] from itself; thus it contains the determination of distinction [*Unterschieds*] essentially.

He goes on in §117 to explain that Leibniz did not understand this, and he in effect substitutes this principle, his, for the identity of indiscernibles, as the right way to think about differentiation.

This is what Leibniz (and Spinoza for that matter) cannot do. And this result reintroduces the issue we see continually reappearing in the logic of essence. The “determinate diversity” is determinately distinctive by being understood as the unique expression of a concrete particular, but that concrete particular has no concreteness except in terms of the unique determinations that concretely specify it.

More generally, a thing’s determinate properties are not, cannot be, a mark of that thing’s unlikeness from other things, just by being those properties. One subject has one property, another has another different property. If one thing is red and another square, we do not thereby know one is *unlike* the other; they are just two different things. A locomotive has nothing to do with a melody; it is not *unlike* a melody. Someone saying that would have to be joking in some way. We are trying to account not for determinate otherness, as in the logic of being, but for how objects that share properties (are like) could be, even with an extraordinary degree of such likeness, still unlike. Kant argued that it was by means of spatial differentiation alone, and, somewhat surprisingly, Hegel is willing to sign on,³⁴ although this all opens up the question of how, in his Philosophy of Nature, he understands such spatial differentiability. Kant appealed to a strictly nonconceptual mode of presentation in his theory of space, an intuitive mode, and Hegel has to concede the role of some such apprehension while denying again such a strict separation. This means that spatial location has to be concept-involving even if not wholly so (which would reassume strict separability). What interests Hegel more now is the way the determinations “like” and “unlike” function in the general logic of essence and appearance. As he puts it,

What we then have is this determination, that the two moments, likeness and unlikeness, are different in one and the same thing, or that their differentiating difference is at the same time one and the same reference. Here is where we have the transition into opposition. (11.272)

This is an abrupt transition to the next topic, the prelude to the discussion of contradiction, and his clarification is relatively unclear. After dismissing as unsatisfying a “like in some respects, unlike in other respects” resolution,

34. See 20.241, 11.116, 11.166–72. These passages make clear that Hegel rejects Leibniz’s principle and accepts a version of Kant’s appeal to spatial location. The point (the rejection) is demonstrated in detail by Southgate (2014). I do not, however, agree that particularity for Hegel is a metaphysical (or logical) primitive. The concept of such a primitive is foreign to Hegel.

which merely avoids rather than confronts the “one and the same” issue, he says:

But it is this reflection which, in one and the same activity, distinguishes the two sides of likeness and unlikeness, by the same token contains them in one activity, and lets the one shine reflected into the other. (11.272)

The implication is that in whatever respect something can be said to be like, it can in *that respect* be said to be unlike, and we have our unusual “two in one” principle again, “like and unlike” but in “*one activity*.”³⁵

Some of this anticipates topics in the logic of the Concept. Two trees are alike in being both trees but unlike in being two individual trees. The idea will be that it is just in their likeness, their way of being alike, that they are unlike (different *trees*), just in the way each distinctly instantiates “tree-ness” that they are unlike. Such a different “way of being a tree” is not another property but the way the *tree*-properties are “had” by the individual.

In this context, as soon becomes clear, Hegel is thinking of the way in which the specifying work of “unlikeness” cannot be a matter of individual properties, atomistically conceived, but unlikeness within likeness is best understood as some content, the unlikeness of which is strict, *even within* such likeness. Some charge can be both positive and negative; some number, 4, can be both +4 and -4; some quantity of money can be an asset and also a debt pending; some force can be attractive and repelling; some distance marched east is canceled by the same distance marched west, and all of these are “opposed” only within some common likeness.³⁶

The opposites do indeed cancel themselves in reference to each other, the result being equal to zero; but there is also present in them their identical reference which is itself indifferent to the opposition; so the two constitute a one. (11.276)

And, just as Michael Wolff has stressed, Hegel tells us that *this* is the sense he means when he invokes the notion of contradiction. It is merely a way of

35. The most important manifestation of this two-that-are-one principle occurs in the logic of the Concept when Hegel is describing the two components of the Idea, concept (*Begriff*) and objectivity (*Objektivität*). See Martin (2012, 422), especially his remark there about “konkrete Einheit, deren analytisch unterscheidbare, real jedoch unabtrennbaren Aspekte Begriff und Objektivität sind.”

36. The two additions to EL §119 are particularly clear on this point.

explaining how the same “reference” can be the same, a basis for likeness (the same number), and yet have diametrically opposed determinations of that content. The “world’s being contradictory” means nothing more than that, as he says, *virtue cannot be virtue by just being other than, different from, in comparison with, vice, but only by “the opposition and the combat in it” against vice* (11.284). The idea of what is called a self-subsistent, independently definable notion of virtue is, he is claiming, impossible.

But, further, by thus being posited as self-subsistent, they make themselves into a positedness. They fate themselves to founder [*Sie richten sich zu Grunde*],³⁷ since they determine themselves as self-identical, yet in their self-identity they are rather the negative, a self-identity which is reference-to-other. (11.281)

So, as with the logic of being, determinations that seem incompatible with each other, like relation to self and relation to other, are not only jointly compatible but jointly necessary as a condition of determinate intelligibility; here an original identification by virtue of which determinate specification can be determinate, and a differentiating specification necessary for the original identification. No wonder Hegel keeps talking about determinations “bending back into” what they are originally opposed to.

Real Opposition

Given the development of the reflection-determination, contradiction, out of the understanding of differentiation as opposition, it should be clear that Hegel is not introducing contradiction as a formal-logical matter, a matter of what Kant called “analytic” contradiction (the logically false), as well as that he objects to Kant’s treatment of dialectical contradiction—the apparently unavoidable commitment to contrary judgments—as something illusory, some sort of mistake (like trying to reason about anything beyond what can be experienced). Hegel is trying to specify how affirming contrary predicates (“in opposition”) does not amount to a *logical* contradiction. That is the point of his discussion, to make this distinction, not to treat such oppositions as if they *were* logically contradictory and then affirm them anyway. As Wolff puts it, Hegel’s orientation (as this extended section of reflection

37. Di Giovanni’s translation is beautiful, but we need to know where we are headed and why—to “Grund.”

makes clear) is not from sentence or predicate negation, but from developments in the understanding of negative numbers and from Kant's defense of Newton on positive and negative magnitudes.³⁸ In general, then, mathematical, not logical negation. In the language Hegel developed, radical differentiation (opposition) can exist within an identity, giving us a way to understand a kind of substantivization of "negativity" and so a resistance to the standard way of thinking about sameness and difference. (This is the type of negation and its implications proper to a logic of being. The negation that is involved in the self-determining development of the *Logic* as a whole is a different issue, addressed in chapter 7.)

It is in this sense that Hegel can assert that contradictions (these sorts of oppositions) are "real," and that Kant had "too much tenderness" for things by attributing dialectical results to thought's error. An amount of money can at the same time be a credit and a debt for the debtor (he has the money, but it is encumbered); a number can be a positive or negative number (Wolff is especially helpful in tracking the significance of the new notion of negative numbers just emerging in Hegel's day, as something other than "subtractive" force);³⁹ a force can be attractive or repelling; a magnitude can be a positive or a negative magnitude. Or, we wanted to say in the logic of being, something like virtue is the contrary of vice *by being virtue*, and yet its determinacy as virtue is constituted by its negative exclusion of vice. Here we want also to say: virtue is virtue by *opposing*, struggling with, vice. And vice is not merely the other of virtue, or the mere privation of virtue (that could also be innocence). It is, Hegel says, taking a stand against virtue, rejecting it, or it does not count as vice. (These are reflected determinations, not qualities. A moving force is not just excluded by a mass with greater inertial force; it is negated, opposed by that force, although all we see are the qualities of motion and then rest.) So we can also say, in Hegelese: if virtue (X) is (is identical with) the active negation of (opposition to) vice (Y), or $X = \sim Y$, and vice is the active negation of (opposition to) virtue, or $Y = \sim X$, then substituting for Y, $X = \sim (\sim X)$; it is what it is as a self-related negated negation.

38. Wolff (1981, 149) is also very helpful on the historical achievement of Hegel in relation to traditional metaphysics, whose overarching conception of negation was privation, determination and lack of determination.

39. Wolff 1981, 65. This means that mathematical negation, as Hegel's model, not logical negation, is wholly relational in just the respect we would expect for Hegel so far. Negativity is not a property of magnitude; only in relation to an *opposed* magnitude can something be taken to be negative (67).

Virtue is in opposition to what is in opposition to virtue (vice). And this is not simply equivalent, as it would be in the logical sense, to $X = X$. Hence all of Hegel's flights into double negation language, and the co-dependence of reflective determinations.⁴⁰

Or, what is opposed to a determination is not the lack or absence of that determination, but a negative determination. Hegel could have just as easily said to make his point, as a direct echo of Newton and Kant's defense, that "negation" is *in the world*. 4 cannot be greater than 3 and less than 3 at the same time; but it can be +4 and -4, and it is both *only in relation to each other*. Or, if the same object can be considered both a thing in itself and an appearance, and these in opposition, then such an object of reflection exists in a state of such self-opposition; it can be considered thereby in "contradictory" determinations.

Ground

Borrowing from Aristotle, we can say that it is possible to know a lot without understanding much. We could know that people who smoke heavily tend to get cancer and heart disease, without understanding this fact. We would understand it if we knew what the relationship was between the two events; if we knew that smoking *caused* cancer and heart disease. We are not satisfied with knowing what happens; we want to know why.⁴¹ Likewise, if we knew that there was some feature of a thing without which such a thing could not be determinately picked out, identified, we would also want to understand how knowing this about that feature could actually explain anything typical of such a thing, could explain its "showings," *Schein*, or manifestations. Hegel introduces this question with one of his lapidary summary claims: "Essence determines itself as ground" (SL 11.291).

But from everything we have seen, the central difficulty of the logic of essence will reappear. To use an empirical example, if the question is something like "Why did the ball fall to the ground?" we want to avoid two kinds of answers: "because whenever a heavy object is dropped from a height, it

40. See Wolff (1981, 107ff.) on this issue. Cf. also the long addition to EL §24, about the story of the Fall, where Hegel gives his own distinctive gloss to the idea that human beings are positively evil as well as positively good, that they exist in this state of separation or dividedness, all as a result of distinguishing themselves from the prelapsarian state of innocence or immediate unity with nature, and so determining themselves as both individual and capable of universal thought.

41. Aristotle 1994b, I.2 71b8–12. The "why" is *to dia ti* (Aristotle 1984, II. 3 194b17–20).

falls”; and “it is in the nature of heavy things to fall.” Doing so, avoiding these alternatives, will allow us to see that the relation between a “ground” and “what it grounds” must be understood as a dynamic relation, one whereby the determinacy of the ground and that of the grounded cannot be fixed in isolation from each other. We can isolate the discussion of ground, but the general point, the necessity of essence, the paradox of essence, and the resolution in this suggestion of a dynamical relation, is paradigmatic for the entire discussion in the second book of the *SL*. So Hegel explores this relational character by discussing “law” (*Gesetz*) and “relation” in general (*Verhältnis*). The summary of where his account is going is given in this passage.

But the being that appears and essential being stand referred to each other absolutely. Thus concrete existence is, third, essential relation; what appears shows the essential, and the essential is in its appearance. — Relation is the still incomplete union of reflection into otherness and reflection into itself; the complete interpenetrating of the two is actuality. (11.323–24)

This “reflection into otherness,” essence and its appearances, for example, or form and the form-matter whole, or ground and grounded, or cause and effect, and then the realization that this otherness is actually a reflection into itself, are all two moments of one whole. Essence is its appearance; ground functions as ground only in the act of grounding, developing as the ground it is as it develops in this act. The general point he keeps making is: a strict separation of the two moments, and an insistence that the nature of an appeal to an essence, or to a causal law, or to someone’s reason for acting cannot be understood as punctuated moments on the billiard-ball model of causation, but involve a kind of unity, the development of a kind of unity, much closer (yet again) to Aristotle on *energeia*. This essential-being-as-activity, manifesting itself in its appearances, is what should count as “actuality.” This has the implication that many existing things have no actuality, are not really “anything.” A lump of dirt, a cough, a strand of wire. To return to a point made earlier, as Sellars points out,⁴² in Aristotle’s conception (the philosophical space where Hegel is trying to locate himself), it is perfectly conceivable that one might walk into a sculptor’s studio, see a block of irregularly shaped

42. Sellars 1967, 78.

marble in the corner, ask the prime question for Aristotle, what is it? (*ti esti*), and be told, “Oh, that. That’s nothing” (it hasn’t been sculpted yet, has no substantial form). The question for Hegel is the question of “actuality,” not “existence,” or the sensibly apprehensible, just as for Aristotle, the question is the “really real,” *to ontōs on*. Hegel makes this point this way:

On this head, it must be remarked that actuality certainly does form the principle of Aristotle’s philosophy, but his actuality is that of the Idea itself, and not the ordinary actuality of what is immediately present . . . More precisely, therefore, Aristotle’s polemic against Plato consists in his designation of the Platonic idea as mere *δύναμις*, and in urging, on the contrary, that the Idea, which is recognized by both of them equally to be alone what is true, should be regarded essentially as *ἐνέργεια*, i.e. the inwardness that is totally to the fore, so that it is the unity of inward and outward. In other words the Idea should be regarded as actuality in the emphatic sense that we have given it here. (EL §142Z)

So it goes too far on this point to suggest, as Longuenesse does, that

Hegel is post-Kantian in that for him the relation between the ‘I think’ and what actually exists is not a relation of description but a relation of constitution. Wirklichkeit is reality as constituted, in all its determinations, by thought. So if Aristotle is called to the stand as a witness against Kant, nevertheless the kind of unity of the intelligible and the sensible affirmed by Aristotle yields to another unity; a unity that emerges at the cost of dissolving and thoroughly digesting the sensible object. There is for Hegel, no immanence of rationality in the immediately present object, and even less . . . any immanence of the rational in a reality external to thought.⁴³

In the first place, “constitution by thought” is expressed in far too Kantian a way and suggests a subjective idealism. The forms of thought are the forms of being; this is a relation of speculative identity, not constituting. Second, there is no dissolving or digesting of the sensible object. The sensible object is left as it is. It is just that the central question of its actuality is a “thought-determination,” one not accessible sensibly, and the *Logic* concerns not that,

43. Longuenesse 2007, 113.

but what it is for that to be its actuality. And third, as Hegel notes in the *PhG*, reason can be said to acquire a certainty that it is “everywhere in the world.” There is no reality (as actuality) “external to thought.” Longuenesse’s formulations do not do justice to what has been a touchstone for us. I cite the relevant passage again.

The logical is to be sought in a system of thought-determinations in which the antithesis between subjective and objective (in its usual meaning) disappears. This meaning of thinking and of its determinations is more precisely expressed by the ancients when they say that *nous* governs the world, or by our own saying that there is reason in the world, by which we mean that reason is the soul of the world, inhabits it, and is immanent in it as its own innermost nature, its universal. (EL §24)

Hegel does not mean reason is in a particular “world.” Reason is the “soul” of *the* world.⁴⁴

As noted in the previous chapter, this dynamical relation, the Ur-relation of all relations in Hegel, is how we should understand rightly the relation between a thing in itself and its appearances, and hence how we can rightly say “we know only appearances” and not mean any phenomenalism. The externalization, then realization that the external is really internal, reflecting out (self-alienation, we could say) and reflecting back, is summarized in this passage.

The thing-in-itself is drawn into a reflection external to it in which it has a manifold of determinations; this is the repelling of itself from itself into another thing-in-itself [*Abstossen seiner von sich selbst in ein anderes Ding-*

44. There is an exemplary statement of Hegel’s position in these terms.

On the other hand, actuality is not so bad or so irrational as it is imagined to be by ‘practical men’ who are devoid of thoughts or at odds with thinking and intellectually derelict. As distinct from mere appearance, actuality, being initially the unity of inward and outward, is so far from confronting reason as something other than it, that it is, on the contrary, what is rational through and through; and what is not rational must, for that very reason, be considered not to be actual. This agrees for that matter, with the usage of educated speech, in that, for example, we would object to recognizing someone who does not know how to bring about something valid and rational as being ‘actually’ a poet or statesman. (EL §142Z)

Someone who claims to be a poet but writes lousy poetry is simply not what a poet must be to be a poet. He is a *Schein*-poet. Only in that sense is he “outside” of the rational.

an-sich], a repelling which is its rebounding [*Gegenstoß*] back into itself, for each thing-in-itself is an other only as reflected back from the other; it has its supposition not in itself but in the other, is determined only through the determinateness of the other; this other is equally determined only through the determinateness of the first. (11.329)

I have tried to show in another book⁴⁵ that the most important, most clarifying implications of this Ur-relation occur in Hegel's practical philosophy, both in his account of the nature of human agency, and in the implications of that account for the practical theory of freedom in his *Philosophy of Right* and theory of objective spirit in general. In fact, were there space in this study to discuss in detail the relation between Hegel's *Logic* and his *Realphilosophie*, both the other two parts of the *Encyclopedia* and his lecture courses, one could show that part of what Hegel means by treating the *Logic* as "the realm of shadows" is that the full demonstration of the truth of this Ur-relation lies in what it actually illuminates, in the cogency and credibility of, for example, an account of agency based on it. It could then be shown what he means by such paradoxical formulations as:

Thus the inner is immediately only the outer, and it is this determinateness of externality for the reason that it is the inner; conversely, the outer is only an inner because it is only an outer. (11.365)

He does not mean here anything as obvious as: when I do something, my executive intention is fulfilled and so becomes something outer, just as what was done, the bodily movement, counts as an action because it expressed this

45. Pippin 2008. The issue is also the central one in Hegel's famous account of "opposed self-consciousnesses" in the *PhG*, as discussed in Pippin 2010. Each of these may confront the other as radically other, its own negation as a free being, a constraint, and come to realize, under the right conditions, that such an other or negation is what it itself is. It comes to see itself in such an other, the most important example in Hegel of the structure of position-negation-negation-of-negation. Understanding this sort of opposition as one covered by this logical statement of the principle helps make clear what is at stake for Hegel.

But thoughtful reason sharpens, as it were, the blunt difference of diverse terms, the mere manifold of representation, to essential distinction, to opposition. Only when driven to the extreme of contradiction are the many of that manifold quickened and alive to each other: they hold the negativity in them which is the inner pulse of self-movement and life [*welche die inwohnende Pulsation der Selbstbewegung und Lebendigkeit ist*]. (11.289)

The question of the meaning of such logical life will be discussed in the next chapter.

ex ante intention. The passage does not say that the inner becomes outer, nor that the outer is the expression of the inner. It says: there is no ex ante intention except as outer. It *is* the outer. And there is no outer except as what must count as inner, not that it expresses a separable inner. There is no such separation.⁴⁶

46. I am responding here to criticisms of McDowell (2007 and elsewhere).

THE LIVES OF CONCEPTS

The Living Concept

Our focus throughout has been on the single question: what does Hegel mean when he says that, as he understands it, logic, his *Science of Logic*, is metaphysics? An immediate subsidiary question is why he says that it is only “now” that logic can be rightly understood as metaphysics, and not as the object- or thing-oriented metaphysics of the Platonic and modern rationalist tradition. Keeping that focus, our interest in the logic of the Concept will have two dimensions in these two chapters. We might call them two aspects of the “metaphysics of life.” We need first a brief summary of where we are in the *Logic* as we begin the logic of the Concept.

I understand the transition to the subjective logic in the following way. The objective logic has established that the truth of objects is the Concept. The distinct way in which an object is what it is, and so its determinate intelligibility, is its concept, as the necessary moments or *Denkbestimmungen* of such concepts have been determined. *The Science of Logic* is a theory of *pure* thinking, and in that context, we seek the *pure concepts*, thinking’s a priori determination of its own norms, without which no object could be determined to be what it is. This is Hegel’s account of first philosophy. First philosophy does not exhaust philosophy. First philosophy distinguishes the question “What is it?” from its question, “What is it to say what something is?” and tries to answer the latter. The former question can be empirical (“What is electricity?”), but it need not be, and can be a philosophical question (“What

is *Geist*?"). How to pose and pursue the latter sort of questions is a topic unto itself. We are concerned with the first philosophical question. In the realm of finite objects, any specification of determinate intelligibility, even if relatively successful, is still limited, or in Kant's sense "conditioned"; in Hegel's sense, if considered as absolute or satisfactory, "contradictory." Since any such rendering intelligible must be self-conscious to be such a judging, such conditionedness and limitation are inseparable from determinate intelligibility itself, and so can be said to "demand" completion in an unconditioned. (Much more on this dynamic in this chapter.) With this established, however, we seek a higher degree of intelligibility (one not subject to such limitations), indeed the highest. And so the concept itself, or conceptuality itself, the truth of finite objectivity, is now our object. In this sense, pure thinking's determination of itself, not just qua the truth of objects, but qua itself as its own object, represents, ultimately, Hegel's unconditioned—pure and absolute self-conscious intelligibility, the intelligibility of intelligibility itself, the Absolute.

Now in the next chapter, we will want to understand why such a meta-logical or metaconceptual inquiry has the structure it does: "Subjectivity," "Objectivity," and "The Idea." The basic idea will be that, having investigated possible objects of knowledge, what it is truly to be any such object, in terms of *their* "truth," their concept (that is, in terms of the basic identity at the heart of the *Logic*—the identity of the forms of thought and the forms of being, the identity of logic and metaphysics), we will now investigate the concept, or conceptuality, in *its* being the truth of objectivity.

Thus the concept is the *truth* of substance, and since *necessity* is the determining relational mode of substance, freedom reveals itself to be the *truth of necessity* and the relational mode of the concept.¹ (12.12)

And,

The concept is now this absolute unity of *being* and *reflection* whereby *being-in-and-for-itself* only is by being equally *reflection* or *positedness* [*Gesetzt-seyn*] and *positedness* only is by being *in-and-for-itself*. (Ibid.)

Two sides of the same coin again, but now from a different point of view, the point of view of conceptuality, *in its having been shown to be the truth*

1. The understanding of any sort of necessity is a manifestation not of necessity but of freedom, thought's self-determination of the nature of necessity in whatever form.

of being. It is in understanding what we have done, in one last turn of self-conscious thought, that we have reached the comprehensive point of view of the Idea, understood as the dual idea of cognition (the idea of the true and the idea of the good), and as thereby understood, the absolute idea.

Hegel himself notes that one way of thinking of the subject matter of the subjective logic is that it provides us with the “concept of the concept” (12.16), and he goes on to note the many Kantian affinities with his project. The concept of the concept, or conceptuality, or conceiving as the truth of being, is the “I’ or pure self-consciousness” (12.17), and he notes Kant’s own version of the truth of any object: Kant defined the object as “the concept in which the manifold is united” at *CPR* B137. Being as such a “positedness,” which is nevertheless being-in-and-for-itself, means that the objectivity of any concept “is none other than the nature of self-consciousness, has no other moments of determinations than the ‘I’ itself” (12.18).²

The important issue in the logic of the Concept that I would like to focus on in this part has two different dimensions. This issue is the claim that the concept of life should be understood as a topic in a speculative logic, a theory of pure thinking. This seems implausible. It is a contingent fact that there are living beings, and we intuitively think that whatever differences there are between living and nonliving beings should be empirically discoverable. The second dimension, the topic in this chapter, concerns the entire *Logic*. We are in the right position now—that is, retrospectively—to understand the frequent metaphor Hegel invokes to characterize his own contribution to a philosophical reflection on logic. This is the claim that speculative concepts are, in their relation to each other, “alive” or interanimating. For example,

Were the logical forms of the concept actually dead, ineffective, and indifferent receptacles of representations or thoughts, then familiarity with them would be a historical record that is quite superfluous and dispensable for the truth. In fact, however, as forms of the concept, they are, to the contrary, the living spirit of the actual, and what is true of the actual is true only

2. Since it is a commonplace in summaries of the idealist tradition to insist that such passages reveal that Hegel is continuing the idealist attempt to show that the world is a “posit” of the subject’s self-conscious positing, that the world depends on the “priority of the subject to exist,” we should note that nothing at all like such a dependence is being claimed, any more than Aristotle was an idealist because he understood a thing’s being what it is as its thinkable form. The intelligible order at issue in Hegel is not a thing or structure, and not a “creation” of spontaneity. It is a determination of pure thinking by pure thinking, the pure thinking necessary for determinate being to be *determinate* being.

by virtue of these forms, through them, and in them. However, the truth of these forms for themselves, let alone their necessary connection, has never been considered and investigated until now. (EL §162)

There is, in other words, the pure concept life, and there is conceptual life, the lives of concepts. Life in general is treated elsewhere, of course, in his Philosophy of Nature and his Philosophy of Spirit, and it has a long history in Hegel's development. Life emerged as an independent topic in the second *Jenaer Systementwürfe* of 1805–6, and the notion played a crucial if opaque role in the most important chapter, on self-consciousness, in his Jena *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Indeed, in the preface to that book, he was already saying that “science,” or logic, “may organize itself only through the proper life of the concept,” and that in such a science, we understand “the self-moving soul of the content which has been brought to fruition” (*die sich bewegende Seele des erfüllten Inhalts* [PhG §53]). The notions of liveliness and enlivened, *Lebendigkeit* and *belebt*, are also the central notions in his account of fine art. But it is the “logical status” of life, its a priori status and therewith its “origin” if not empirical, that he regarded as the fundamental issue. The summary formulation of the concept life is that life is the “Idea” (aka “The Truth,” or what is, in its truth, the actualized concept) “in its immediacy.” In Hegel's treatment, once we properly understand the logical structure of life, by which he means, for living being, the unique relation of an object to its concept, we will be in a position to understand that relation (object and concept) in Knowing (*Erkennen*) in both its theoretical and practical dimensions, and this will allow a retrospective summation of the truth of that relation in “the Absolute Idea.” He is referring to the fact that an instance of an organic kind not merely is subsumable under a concept, but exemplifies its kind well or poorly. In such cases we can speak of near perfection or deformity. We can't say that about an even number, or plutonium. This acknowledgment then raises the question of being as being-true. What it is to be in truth is for something to exemplify what it is to be such a thing, to manifest its concept.

As we have noted before, if we understand the structure of the *Logic* as some kind of ascent or progress, and if we think of that progress as measured by degrees of any rendering intelligible, the former stage always requiring the latter as condition, then the essential predicative forms we study in the *Logic's* three books will be (i) S is P, (ii) S is essentially P, and (iii) S is a good P. Teleological explanation (for artifacts, actions, and organic beings) is the beginning of wisdom about such a higher degree of intelligibility, and so will help us understand why the conceptual structure involved in understanding

living beings best realizes what *Erkennen* in both its theoretical and its practical dimensions seeks. (On this scale the “absolutely” intelligible would be, to use Aryeh Kosman’s phrase for a similar claim in Aristotle, “thinking thinking thinking.”)³ Put another way, the “pure thinking” that was the source of any possible objective determinateness (*Bestimmtheit*) in the objective logic is now itself the object as well as the subject of thinking in the “subjective logic.” Thinking is pure thinking in this treatment, but the metalogical inquiry must be able to account for what we have seen in the objective logic, that thinking as such has a developmental and dynamic structure. Accordingly, in this chapter we will discuss the dynamism of pure thinking itself (in Kant and in Hegel); in the next chapter the notion that organic life is a logical concept; and in the final chapter the unity of the theoretical and practical idea.

Here the issue is what Hegel’s frequently invoked metaphor, that concepts have a “life,” that they “move,” that they are in some sense “alive,” really amounts to. We have been tracking that issue all along, and now that the topic of the *Logic* is conceptuality itself, it is time to address it. The issue is already introduced in the closing words of the logic of essence, where Hegel tells us that, with the topic of the concept as such, we are entering “the realm of subjectivity and freedom” (11.409), a language that has an unmistakable but mysterious practical air. He makes a little clearer what that might mean in a preliminary remark (*Vorbericht*), dated July 21, 1816. I say only a little clearer because he moves immediately to explain that metaphor with several other metaphors, with a reference to the Christian Bible and to a poem by Klopstock.⁴ He reminds us that there is already a well-established, long-standing conventional understanding of logic, and so of the Concept (which

3. Kosman 2013, 231.

4. The figurative, especially metaphorical language reaches a kind of culmination (or excess, depending on one’s point of view) when Hegel starts to explain the relation between conceptuality broadly understood and conceptualized particulars. (It is a passage, especially the ambition not to do violence to what is conceptualized, which Adorno should have paid much closer attention to it than he obviously did.)

The universal is therefore *free power* [*freie Macht*]; it is itself while reaching out to its other and embracing it, but without *doing violence* to it; on the contrary, it is at rest in its other as *in its own*. Just as it has been called free power, it could also be called *free love* and *boundless blessedness* [*freie Liebe und schrankenlose Seeligkeit*], for it relates to *that which is distinct from it as to itself*; in it, it has returned to itself. (12.35)

I take a stab at an interpretation of this general idea in Pippin (2003), but I am dissatisfied with it, as I am with the account of the logic of the Concept in Pippin (1989). (Attributing to Hegel a “conceptual scheme idealism” without also explaining in detail why there is not and could not be a scheme-content distinction is, was, obviously misleading.)

I will capitalize when the topic is, as it mostly is throughout the third book, conceptuality itself). There is, he notes, a textbook understanding of concepts and their roles in judgments and the role of judgments in syllogisms. But he complains that such “material” is not only “finished” (*fertiges*) and “entrenched” (*festgewordenes*) but “ossified” (*verknöchertes*). His task, he says, is to introduce a “fluidity” (*Flüssigkeit*) into such material and to spark or ignite or animate (*entzünden*) a living concept in such dead matter (*den lebendigen Begriff in solchem todtten Stoffe* [12.5]). He then complains about the difficulty of his task, switching metaphors again, and compares his project to building a new city in “devastated” land (*öden Land*), a task rendered all the more difficult when the land is occupied by an ancient and “solidly constructed” city. One must decide above all, he insists, *not* to make use of what is already there, “not to make use of much otherwise valued stock” (*von vielem sonst wertgeachtetem des Vorraths*).

What exactly is he talking about? More figurative language follows. We will presumably understand better how he understands this novel approach to the Concept when we understand that the essential issue is “truth.” He indicates he means “truth” in that sense which now stands under great suspicion, the same suspicion that Pontius Pilate expressed when he asked the crowd “What is truth?” As the quotation from Klopstock is meant to confirm, the question is meant as a mocking one at worst, a skeptical one at best. The reference is to John 18:38.

‘Then you are a king?’ Pilate said. ‘You say that I am a king,’ Jesus answered. ‘For this reason I was born and have come into the world, to testify to the truth. Everyone who belongs to the truth listens to my voice.’ ‘What is truth?’ Pilate asked. And having said this, he went out again to the Jews and told them, ‘I find no basis for a charge against him.’

In the interpretation we have been developing, this unusual passage returns us here to issues first addressed in chapter 2, and to the passage quoted there. It is worth repeating:

The science that has pure knowledge for its principle and is a unity which is not abstract but living and concrete, so that the opposition of consciousness between a being subjectively existing for itself, and another but objectively existing such being, has been overcome in it, and being is known to be in itself a pure concept and the pure concept to be true being. These,

then, are the two moments contained in logic. But they are now known to exist inseparably, not as in consciousness, where each exists for itself; it is for this reason and this reason alone, because they are at the same time known to be distinct [*unterschiedene*] (yet not to exist for themselves), that their unity is not abstract, dead and inert, but concrete. (21.45)

To be is to be determinate, a this, not a that; but anything can be a determinate this only as a this-such. Determinacy is conceptual determinacy. So what a thing is, in its “truth,” is its concept. At the level of the most general formulation of this claim, the Concept, conceptuality as such, is the truth of being. There are many alternate formulations given in the opening section proper of the logic of the Concept: the truth of being is the concept, the “absolute unity of being”; it is being in and for itself, or most generally “*Gesetztsein*,” positedness. Hegel claimed that positedness was the result of the analysis of substance; positedness means being as being rendered intelligible, that what it is to be anything determinate is ultimately the self-determining (and so internally self-negating) concept. Therein lies its life, but that has remained extremely abstract so far. And it is important that being is conceptuality, not a material “made” intelligible by the exercise of a subjective power, as if intelligible only “for us,” as if “our activity” alone constitutes this life. *What a thing is*, in truth, is its intelligibility, or the Concept with all that has come to entail: the self-conscious and self-determining conceptual moments necessary for anything to be the determinate thing it is, for concepts to function as the ground of determinacy.⁵ Hence the question: what is such self-determining such that it is at the same time an aspect of being in its intelligibility and the activity of thinking?

We have become, Hegel notes, skeptical about the question of what anything is in truth. This is the point of the Pilate reference. In the presence of truth, he asks skeptically, “What is truth?” as if to say, “who knows?” Thus, he finds there is no basis in any charge against Jesus. It is likewise with questions like: What truly is religion? What truly is it to be a human being, *Geist*? What truly is art? All questions he will raise in the *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*. In the *Logic* the question is dual: What is being such that it is intelligible? What is the intelligibility of being? For us, Hegel complains, the

5. We noted in chapter 3 what is highlighted in this section: that by “the concept” Hegel simply means the apperceptive I, the structure of conceptuality as apperceptive judgments in inferential relations.

question seems to live on only in religion. “*The*” question that philosophy uniquely pursues is not altogether clear yet, but later Hegel indicates that he means to differentiate questions about various empirical concepts and causal relations from an inquiry into conceptuality and causality (or substantiality) as such. Or he will say things like: philosophy (and he seems to be thinking of philosophy as exhibited in the *Phenomenology of Spirit*) is interested not in a simple factual narrative of what happened but instead in what “is true in what happens,” where that seems to mean what, in what happened, reveals something about what it is to be *Geist* (12.22). In the *Logic*, “the question” is, what is it for anything truly to be what it is? But now with Hegel, so goes the bold claim, philosophy can regain its rightful position as the path to such issues. This competition was already suggested by Hegel’s assuming the role of Jesus in the Pilate analogy. It is *Hegel* who apparently now truly understands “Everyone who belongs to the truth listens to my voice.” That is, he understands it better than Jesus. (It is quite a remarkable passage for those with a theological interpretation of Hegel.) The chief task of philosophy is to account for this conceptuality. We have been concentrating on how it can be shown that any objective being can be what it truly is only because of a conceptual determinacy that requires an understanding of qualitative and quantitative modes of determinacy (also called simply “being” and “immediacy”), and an understanding of essence and appearance (also called reflection and mediation). This account is what he soon will call the “becoming” of the logic of the Concept; we have shown the “foundational” status of the concept, not by beginning with it but by having arrived at it as a result (12.11). Now we turn our attention to the concept of conceptuality itself, a reflexive self-determination of conceptuality itself which thereby is the “absolute” or highest mode of intelligibility, the concept’s self-explication. (Hegel begins calling the subject matter of the logic of the Concept the “concept of the concept” at 12.16.) As we have seen throughout, to revert to Kosman’s formulation, only pure thinking can determine what it is to be thinking, where this first means pure thinking’s determination of what it is to think anything other than thought. Now we are on the verge of the Aristotelian heights: pure thinking thinking thinking itself as its object. As we noted earlier in describing the difficult task German Idealism sets itself, it is *in* thinking thinking thinking that thinking thinks *anything that can be thought, or being*. Because of this self-reflective autonomy, Hegel also wants to call the account the “realm of freedom and subjectivity.” (It is, by being the realm of pure thinking, a “cause of itself” [*die Ursache ihrer selbst*] and so the substance “freed” into

the concept [*die zum Begriffe befreite Substanz*] [12.16].) This has to do not with the production of thoughts, but with something like the Concept's self-authorization.

It will take us a while to unpack the full implications of this latter claim (especially since Hegel initially explains it by saying that freedom will be shown to be the "truth of necessity and the relational mode of the concept" [12.12]), but our task now is to understand that chief metaphor of the *Vorbericht*. What could it mean to understand concepts not as dead *Stoff*, but as "alive"? I propose that we in effect "back up" quite far and get something of a running start before leaping into that new territory, by preparing ourselves (always a good idea in modern German philosophy) with Kant.

Kant on Reason's *Conatus*

In turning to Kant's own views of the dynamism of reason, we should first note something of the highest importance that we have mentioned before. Especially given later worries about "psychologism" in neo-Kantianism, and because it has been a persistent criticism of any Kant-indebted Hegel that this *must* amount to a "subjective idealism," turning to the status of "mental activity" in Kant is a vexed and difficult issue, also worthy of a long, independent treatment. Very briefly, as Kant sees it, when we attend to what a subject must be able to do to count as a knower or a doer, what capacities she must have, our conclusion is supposed to be a logical one, dependent on the concept of knowing itself or acting itself (the determination of which must be reason's self-determination, as Kant often insists), not on any psychological matters of fact. In that sense a cognitive mental act is neither mere "activity," in the sense in which we might speak of a computer's processing as its current activity (cognitive activity is norm responsive), nor an intentional action (one does not perceive or believe "on purpose"). Knowing as a capacity, in its actualization, has a distinct form, without which it would not be a case of knowing. We may intentionally or "on purpose" take up the task of trying to understand why something happened, but as we gather evidence and test hypotheses, we are not—in, say, perceiving, or in judging on the basis of perceiving—intentionally doing something for the sake of something. The power of perceiving or the power of knowing (or their failure) is what it is (has its distinct end) in independence from whatever else we may also be trying to accomplish. According to Aristotle, for example, the actuality of an axe, its formal and final cause, is cutting, the actuality of the eye is

seeing. None of this implies that the axe or the eye is *purposively acting* in its proper actualization. Cognitive activity is an actualization in that sense. But it is also true that the capacities of the eye are *for an end*, its distinct end as what it is, or *qua* eye. And in that sense the capacities necessary for knowing are for an end which knowing has, *qua* knowing. (The spontaneous capacity too has a formal and final causality, not serial or successive, but immanent and simultaneous.)

Moreover, Kant's talk of *separate* powers can be misleading, especially as it concerns the understanding and reason, capacities so central to the argument of the first *Critique*, and now as it concerns the topic or faculty he discovered much later, reflective judgment. They are not separate capacities in the way that swimming might be one capacity an individual has, and speaking Russian another capacity. The understanding and reason (and finally, reflective judgment) are manifestations of one capacity, thinking, the spontaneous faculty, differentiated in terms of their different functions in different contexts. There is understanding, *Verstand*, or thinking, considered with respect to what is the case, or in terms of the possible objects of thought, in the basic sense of claiming or judging about objects other than thought, objects that must be provided to such thinking, cannot be self-given, all on the one hand; and, on the other, reason, *Vernunft*, thinking considered without such restriction, or thinking in so far as it is purely self-determining, thinking whose object is itself.⁶ In this latter sense, one thinks first, of course, of pure practical rationality, self-determining both in the sense that only reason can determine what the exercise of practical reason consists in, and in the sense that to act is to have a maxim one must give oneself, or it is to have a reason for the action that one counts as such a reason. But reason in its theoretical use, what Kant calls its "hypothetical use," is also self-determining. Here is one formulation of the issue:

If the understanding may be a faculty of unity of appearances by means of rules, then reason is the faculty of the unity of the rules of understanding under principles. Thus it never applies directly to experience or to any

6. It is by distinguishing, as different faculties, reason and the understanding, and so strongly distinguishing constitutive and regulative, that Kant hopes to "resolve" in some fashion the problem of the antinomies. It is by claiming that the understanding, taken to be directed at the pure forms of intuition, is sufficient unto itself, is not *constitutively* subject to what reason demands (the unconditioned), that its synthetic a priori knowledge can be defended without antinomial or paralogistic results.

object, but instead applies to the understanding, in order to give unity a priori through concepts to understanding's manifold cognitions, which may be called 'the unity of reason,' and is of an altogether different kind than any unity that can be achieved by the understanding. (CPR B359/A302)

The structure of reason in this use is broadly syllogistic, as it is in Hegel, because Kant thinks of the basic model of inferring as syllogistic. In the first *Critique* and the logic lectures model, the understanding is responsible for some general principle or law, judgment determines whether an individual or event falls under the law, and reason draws the inference. And in general, reason in this hypothetical use results in descending or ascending specification, even though all of this is only the beginning of Kant's account of the various functions reason performs. But understanding as it is used in this quotation cannot be a distinct *object* for or to reason, as such objects are normally understood. That would be psychology. Reason's determination of the unity of the "manifold cognitions" of the understanding is the determination by thought of itself, of its own unity. (This perfectly parallels the Analytic's claim that experience, the possible representation of an object at all, requires a unity that cannot be supplied by experience. Thinking provides this unity for itself, by itself.) Any such higher unity can never be an object of experience, but it is also the case that such postulations are not mere heuristic posits, dispensable or alterable as practical needs dictate. Every exercise of reason qua reason is a *necessary* self-determination (and obviously, it is with this sort of language that we are already in Hegel country). It is in this sense that reason has a logical use. Its determination of the relations among thoughts without which thinking could not be thinking at all (or logic) is, again, a self-determination, a self-constituting act, not a grasping or perceiving. It must be so in order to keep faith with Kant's most important break with the prior (ancient and modern) rationalist tradition and with the modern empiricist tradition. All thinking is a spontaneity, an activity, not a perceiving or a grasping. This is true for reflective judging as well.⁷ It is this *Spontaneität* considered in terms of a special function, "determining" a unity without which various empirical diversities would not be fully intelligible but which is distinct

7. I note again that Hegel (to formulate this in the crudest terms) wants to replace the model of some sort of immediacy grasped as such and then mediated with a model of always mediated immediacy, or "always being mediated immediacy" (which amounts, in the essence chapter, to a positing reflection that reflects on its results). As we saw in chapter 5, that notion of a "mediated immediacy" has a good claim to count as the single most important notion in Hegel.

from reason's self-determined demand to seek the unconditioned, the highest form of unity, and a unity which cannot be said to be based on empirical material itself. (I assume it is also clear that this *capacity* itself cannot be said to have a dynamic. The rational being—any rational being, whether human or not—in the exercise of this capacity is exercising a purposively structured capacity.) I turn now to more detail about this manifestation of spontaneity.

What is important for our discussions is the simple fact that the activity of attending under such a principle is itself purposive, an active, teleologically structured attending. (In the first *Critique*, Kant called reason a “purposive activity” (*zweckmäßige Tätigkeit* [B128/A94]), in effect, if not literally, the very same language Hegel uses in the preface of the *Phenomenology* (*daß die Vernunft das zweckmäßige Tun ist* [PhG §22]). Very simply put, we must be looking for (and so assuming) as a goal regularities and similarities in order for them to show up appropriately. And here is what Kant says in the published introduction to the *Critique of the Power of Judgment* about the necessity of our doing so, or the nature of reason's authority in this case, as he introduces a strange term we have seen before in this study.

The power of judgment thus also has in itself an a priori principle for the possibility of nature, though only in a subjective respect, by means of which it prescribes a law, not to nature (as autonomy), but to itself (as heautonomy) for reflection on nature, which one could call the law of the specification of nature with regard to its empirical laws.⁸

This self-directed, heautonomous activity is an idea not unique to the third *Critique*, even though he does not use that strange neologism elsewhere. In fact he describes the whole project of the first *Critique* in these self-engendering terms, something Hegel always insisted on. Kant is interested in the *Critique of Pure Reason* in what he says our “cognitive faculty . . . provides out of itself” (B1). Hegel will ask why we should not also say that the categorical structure of experience is what reason requires of itself, with no threat of subjectivism if understood properly; why not say that the moral law is what reason requires of itself? Why isn't the principle of *all* philosophy heautonomy?

Kant tells us that “the proper principle of reason in general (in its logical use) is to find the unconditioned for conditioned cognitions” (*CPR* B364/

8. Kant 2000, 72.

A307). And it is in this context that he begins to speak of “this need of reason” (*dieses Bedürfnis der Vernunft* [B365/A309]) for such an attempt, and so introduces the thought that the exercise of reason is purposive, must be understood to have an end. He makes the same point several times in introducing us to the ideas of reason. In discussing Plato, he says,

Plato noted very well that our power of cognition [*Erkenntniskraft*] feels a far higher need [*ein weit höheres Bedürfnis fühle*] than that of merely spelling out appearances according to a synthetic unity in order to be able to read them as experience, and that our reason naturally exalts itself to cognitions that go much too far for any object that experience can give ever to be congruent, but that nonetheless have their reality [*ihre Realität haben*] and are by no means merely figments of the brain [*Hirngespinnste*]. (CPR B370/A314)

This is the same language he uses in the published introduction to the third *Critique*: “Consequently, since the lawful unity in a combination that we cognize as in accordance with a necessary aim [*einer notwendigen Absicht*] (a need [*Bedürfnis*] of the understanding) but yet at the same time as contingent in itself is represented as a purposiveness of the objects . . .”⁹ He does not explain how an *Erkenntniskraft* can “feel” a need, but it is not hard to construct an explanation. Since, according to Kant’s apperception requirement, any judging is also the consciousness of judging (no one can be *claiming something* without knowing that is what she is doing), judging must be implicitly a subscription to the requirements of any such judging (thus including the commitment to be able to provide reasons for the judgment, to be denying anything inconsistent with the judgment and so forth, to be able to integrate the judgment in a consistent whole of other beliefs held), and more broadly, any putative act of knowing involves apperceptively a putative realization of what knowing should be. In this sense the attempt to know, *Erkennen*, as centrally a judging, is also a self-consciously purposive activity, end-directed (it aims at knowledge, *Wissen*, unqualifiedly and unconditionally knowledge) and self-constituting (only reason can determine what the removal of such qualifications would amount to). In the case of the understanding, or judging informed by sensible intuition, this means that any instance of judging is an awareness that the judgment is a piece of conditioned knowledge, and no

9. Kant 2000, 71.

such awareness, since it is an awareness of an attempt to know, can avoid in the completion of the pursuit of such an end this “need” to seek the unconditioned. Such an end is inseparable from any pursuit of the end of knowing itself. This appears to be what he means by “feeling” a need.

Now of course Kant also thought that this need could not be satisfied, that our desire must remain unrequited (like an unrequited lover, in a simile Kant himself used to describe the fate of metaphysics). But this limitation is often misunderstood. For the fullest statement of Kant’s position is that while there are metaphysical questions whose answers we cannot, strictly speaking, know, it is also the case that these are matters that we also cannot doubt. “Unknowable but indubitable” is his highly heterodox position. And that “cannot be *doubted*” introduces a kind of practical necessity into the picture that is very relevant to our theme. For Kant’s picture is not of lost souls tapping around, tragically lost in the dark, despite a famous image that suggests this. Rather he is suggesting that our relation to these issues is not a relation of knowing in the experiential or empirical sense, suggesting that the issues themselves are wrongly conceived when understood this way. The relation is some sort of practical relation, or a practical *Faktum*, which carries with it its own sort of practical necessity, one that can be said to have a priority — again a practical priority — over the capacities and limitations of reason in its theoretical use. It is the same sort of practical necessity that is at issue in reason’s *Bedürfnis*, in the *inevitability* of the attempt to ascend to the unconditioned, and so it delimits the kind of *practical reality* he was referring to when he said that the domain outside of what could be experienced had “its own *Realität*,” was not a realm of *Hirngespinnste*. It is this notion of practical necessity that I want now to pursue in Hegel.

Hegel on Reason’s Need

The issue of reason’s internal dynamic, its conative dimension, arises at the heart of everything distinctive in Hegel’s project. For example, none of his books has a deductive or analytic structure, but always a developmental one. They are all structured around what he often calls thought’s or the concept’s “movement.” As we have seen several times, his most frequent word for all the categorical concepts treated by the *Science of Logic* is thought-determination, *Denkbestimmung*, and he means thought’s gradual and finally exhaustive *self*-determination, its determination of what it is to be thinking objectively, in the sense of either claiming what is the case or asserting what ought to be

done. (Kant's terms are probably not ultimately helpful, but we can use them to say that for Hegel reason's authority is a matter of a *heautonomy* that is also an *autonomy*.) Thought, for Hegel also understood as itself a mode of engagement with the world and others, is internally animated, and so even the forbidding *Science of Logic* has to be understood as just as much a kind of *narrative* in its way as the much better known *Phenomenology of Spirit*, as much as the lectures on fine art, religion, and world history are narratives, and his claim is that these narratives have a teleological structure, and that means an internal necessity.

As we have seen in some detail since chapter 2, the most difficult idea behind the project of the *Logic* is its assumption that we do not need any Kantian "transcendental deduction," establishing that pure forms of thought are the forms of being. The assumptions behind that kind of a project are misleading and rejected in the *Phenomenology of Spirit*, entertained there in order to free ourselves from them, from the idea of a subject-object divide, or gap, which must be bridged. Instead, as commentators of many different sorts (including this commentator in chapter 5) have always realized, an enormous justificatory weight is placed on the beginning of the *Logic*. Hegel, in introducing his own idea of what Kant would call a transcendental not a general logic (not the conditions for thinking as such, but the necessary conditions of thought's having an object), entertains the bare thinkability of anything at all in order to establish that such a mere prospect, mere being, considered in its pure indeterminacy, is not a thinkable thought, and not because of any subjective limitation on our part. Thought is determinate, discursive, and anything that can be thought is therefore determinately articulable (primarily predicatively). To consider being in its thinkability is simply to think it *as it is*. The forms of thought are the forms of being because to be is to be intelligible. (This is Aristotelian, as we have often said, but also, in a different register, Frege's thought: "A fact is a thought that is true.")¹⁰ And intelligibility is always determinate, this and not that. This is the first result of the *Logic*, and Hegel names this relation of "this and not that" "becoming," *Werden*. Whatever turns out to be necessary to fulfill the conditions of such determinacy, conditions necessary for thought to have determinate objects, is the exfoliation of the articulability of being itself. As inadequacies are revealed in satisfying this condition of determinateness, those inadequacies count as ontologically inadequate. Being has not been sufficiently understood in its

10. Frege 1997b, 27.

determinateness. We should recall the way Hegel put the point in §24 of the *Encyclopedia Logic*, when he wrote that “*nous* governs the world.”¹¹

The logical is to be sought in a system of thought-determinations in which the antithesis between subjective and objective (in its usual meaning) disappears. This meaning of thinking and of its determinations is more precisely expressed by the ancients when they say that *nous* governs the world, or by our own saying that there is reason in the world, by which we mean that reason is the soul of the world, inhabits it, and is immanent in it as its own innermost nature, its universal.

To summarize our discussions in chapters 2 and 3, Hegel is referring to the ancients here because, as he so often is throughout the *Logic*, he is thinking of Aristotle. The basic unit of sense-making, in Aristotle, in Kant, and in a revised way in Hegel, is the predicative act. So, as noted in chapter 2, in Aristotle we can study actuality by studying the predicative act. What there is must be determinate, and its “determinations” are just possible predicates, the content of which depends on their roles in possible judgments, possible copulative relations. Entities are the determinate entities they are “in terms of” or “because of” their concept or substantial form. For all of these similarities, though, it is Kant, and the doctrine of knowledge as a productive power, or reason as spontaneity, that separates Hegel from Aristotle.¹²

So in knowing itself, *what* pure thought knows is the intelligibility, the knowability, of anything that is. But the intelligibility of anything is just the answer to the “what it is to be that thing” (or said more precisely: in answer to the “what is it to be able to say what something is”) question definitive of metaphysics since Aristotle. So in knowing itself, thought knows of all things what it is to be anything. Again, as for Aristotle, the task of metaphysics is not to say of any particular thing what it is. That is the task of the special sciences: medicine, statecraft. It is to determine what must be true of anything at all,

11. EL §24, cited twice before on p. 13 and p. 248.

12. This is actually a larger topic than can be economically discussed here. The topic is something like “the emergence of subjectivity” in philosophy, and not just in philosophy but as a world-historical event. At the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century, some sort of awareness that the world and others were not unproblematically available for observers and agents, but that the subject was in some sort of relation to itself in its possible relation to the world and others, was clearly emerging in Cervantes, Caravaggio, Shakespeare, and others, until finally it all found its radical philosophical expression in Descartes. All that separates Hegel from Aristotle too, but that is a topic worth several books.

such that what it is in particular can be determined (or: what is necessarily presupposed in any such specification).

Those terms Hegel uses to describe the developmental aspect of his methodology—movement, moment, animation, even “pulsation” or “alive”—might now be, in the context of Kant’s claims about reason, perhaps not so mysterious. This connection with Kant’s views on the purposive and productive nature of reason can, though, be difficult to make out. The first reason for this is that the radicality of Kant’s position is often not fully appreciated, his insistence that reason never “begs” from nature but always “commands” (CPR B681/A653) and his adoption of the mathematical sciences as his model for philosophy. That is, his famous proposal is that objects must conform to reason’s wholly *self*-determined requirements, rather than the other way around, in just the same sense that Newtonian mechanics is not an empirical science—the Copernican revolution, in other words. (Newtonian mechanics is also not a subjective grid imposed on nature; it represents the “truth” of nature.) Here is how Hegel puts his self-determination claim:

They [pure essentialities, logical concepts] are pure thoughts, spirit that thinks its essence. Their self-movement is their spiritual life and is that through which science constitutes itself, and of which it is the exposition. (21.8)

When he tries to explain this later on that page, he makes even more use of his own formulations, which are idiosyncratic to say the least.

This spiritual movement, which in its simplicity gives itself its determinateness, and in this determinateness gives itself its self-equality—this movement, which is thus the immanent development of the concept, is the absolute method of the concept, the absolute method of cognition and at the same time the immanent soul of the content.—On this self-constructing path alone, I say, is philosophy capable of being objective, demonstrative science. (Ibid.)

I cannot see that there is any essential difference between this position and that articulated by Kant in all the major sections of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, in the “pure” derivation of categories through the Metaphysical Deduction, in the general goal of establishing a priori that such categories are not subjective impositions but constitute what it could be to be an object

of experience, and in the derivation of reason's structure for the understanding's knowledge, that structure that, for Kant, had its own "reality." That self-determining activity is given its most ambitious expression in the doctrine of reflective judgment. Hegel certainly has a different evaluation of the results. (More on this in the next chapter.) He sees them not as self-imposed limitations on reason, but as constituting the intelligible structure of reality, and there is a radical boldness in his rejection of the idea of a reality or truth beyond any ability of ours to determine what it is.

But it is in his account of how his project will show that this "movement" occurs that matters get apparently un-Kantian. For Hegel says,

contradiction is the root of all movement [*Bewegung*] and vitality [*Lebendigkeit*]; it is only in so far as something has a contradiction within it that it moves, has an urge [*Trieb*] and activity [*Tätigkeit*]. (11.286)

Or, as he puts it further along in the logic of essence,

Now the negativity just considered constitutes the turning point of the movement of the concept. It is the simple point of the negative self-reference, the innermost source of all activity [*Tätigkeit*], of living and spiritual self-movement [*Selbstbewegung*]; it is the dialectical soul which everything true possesses and through which alone it is true; for on this subjectivity [*Subjektivität*] alone rests the sublation [*Aufhebung*] of the opposition between concept and reality, and the unity which is truth. (12.246)

If we keep in mind this Kantian context, recall the essentially practical and productive character of the power of reason, recall that the sense-bearing unit of intelligibility for both Kant and Hegel is the judgment, and that judgments are necessarily self-conscious judgments, and so claimable only in the context of some awareness of their finitude or conditioned nature, then claims like these by Hegel look less mysterious.

The upshot of all these reminders is that the contradiction that Hegel is referring to is always *an essentially practical contradiction*, an *activity's* contradiction of its own end, something that gets clearer, I hope, if we recall Kant's account of the inherent purposiveness of reflective judgment and the hypothetical use of reason. Take, for example, the kind of things he says about the necessity of any development, that of the empirical sciences, for example. He

will often say things that seem outrageous philosophically: that philosophy gives the form of necessity to what would otherwise appear merely contingent, as at EL §12A. This can sound as if Hegel wants to say that the actual course of that development, philosophy can prove, could not have happened otherwise, as if, in science as well as philosophy (logic), there is a development over time that could not have been otherwise. If this sort of claim is supported by a claim about a self-transforming, underlying metaphysical entity, “cosmic spirit,” or “God,” developing according to some necessary law of internal teleology, then the claim seems hopeless. At a more modest level, though (and this is very much how I think he wants to be understood), he could mean that a significant transition in art history, or political history, or religious history, a shift in collective ethical commitments, or a development in a speculative logic (that the content of some determinate concept cannot be fixed without reliance on a successor, more comprehensive concept) can all be rendered intelligible by a philosophical account. This account is based on a form of practical contradiction that introduces a more familiar form of necessity and one different from logical necessity or material necessity, the form appropriate to “he who wills the end *must* will, or necessarily wills, the means” (otherwise we have evidence that he has not truly willed the end). If a collective attempt to accomplish some goal can be said to learn collectively that commitment to that end is impossible without commitment to, let us say, a broader and more comprehensive end, then it must pursue such a new end or give up the enterprise. Or if it develops that the means chosen actually make achieving the end impossible, then the means *must* be altered. They are not arbitrarily altered. They *must* be altered, on pain of practical incoherence. A philosophical account, assuming the rationality of such a teleological enterprise, can show this. It can give the form of (practical) necessity to what would otherwise seem contingent alterations. (So if reason can be said to have an end indispensable to its possible realization, any means indispensable to that end are likewise indispensable, necessary in that sense. This sort of argument plays out at the highest level of conceptual abstraction for Hegel.)

As noted before, the paradigmatic and most important instance of this sort of conceptual self-determination occurs at the outset of the *Logic*, in the demonstration of the absurdity of any attempt to think “being qua being.” The mark of the practical nature of this beginning is his remark that, at the beginning of the attempt, “There is only present the resolve [*Entschluß*], which can also be viewed as arbitrary, of considering thinking as such” (21.56). This is a failure that demonstrates the necessarily discursive nature

of thinking (“to think being” is not thinking at all; neither, for that matter, can there be any “grasping” of horseness or seeing beauty in itself). This kind of self-correcting enterprise, with the same ontological import, reappears throughout. So a view that seeks to account for determinateness of objects, and so for our capacity to account for such determinateness, in terms strictly of directly apprehensible qualitative and quantitative predication (what he calls a logic of being), is argued to be unable to achieve its purpose, cannot provide more than endless, unrestricted lists of properties and measures, and so to fail to specify determinateness. Any such attempt to do so is necessarily self-consciously such an attempt, and that means aware of the proximal end that would count as success in such an enterprise: this being successfully *fully* differentiated from that. In terms similar to those of Kant’s account of the necessity of some dissatisfaction with conditioned knowledge and so of the “need” of reason to be “felt,” awareness of this deficiency is inextricably linked with an awareness of what must be done to correct it.

Such a self-reflective movement in developments like the latter is what Hegel is trying to summarize in his own inimitable way in this passage.

Internal self-movement, self-movement proper, drive in general (the appetite or *nisus* of the monad, the *entelechy* of the absolutely simple essence) is likewise nothing else than that something is, in itself, itself and the lack of itself (the negative), in one and the same respect. Abstract self-identity is not yet vitality; but the positive, since implicitly it is negativity, goes out of itself and sets its alteration in motion. Something is alive, therefore, only to the extent that it contains contradiction within itself: indeed, force is this, to hold and endure contradiction within. (11.287)

Here he is referring to the “contradiction” that he develops in the logic of essence, first that we cannot differentiate the essential from nonessential properties without knowing the essence, yet we cannot know the essence without specifying just these essential properties. It might of course seem improbable that one could get so much conceptual content out of reflection on the conditions for determinate predication, but the point here is only to show the initial bearing of these Kantian elements: the essentially practical and productive character of the power of reason, the sense-bearing unity of intelligibility as the judgment, and the necessarily self-conscious character of judgments, which can be claimed only in the context of some awareness of their finitude or conditioned nature.

Finally, this leaves us with a problem much too large to address adequately. I have suggested that this model of reason's purposive activity, with its corollary that reason's understanding of itself, of just this, its own activity, is necessarily developmental, that this development in Hegel is not driven by empirical discovery or the forming of more successfully adaptive strategies, and its additional corollary that this development is driven by an essentially practical form of contradiction, or a self-contradiction, can be understood only within a much wider frame than cognitive consistency or the achieving of compatible commitments. This is because the process just crudely sketched, something like an account of possible account-givings, has as its goal a kind of self-knowledge that plays a crucial role in Hegel's theory of freedom and its realization. That theory of freedom is not a free will or individual causal agency theory, and rather depends essentially on a collectively achieved, shared understanding (one become habitual and implicit in ordinary life) of one's involvement with institutions and with others, generally described as *being-with-self-in-others*. At a limited level of "logical" self-understanding, such as what Hegel calls *Verstand*, these relations cannot be properly understood, and instead are thought of either as sacrifices of individuality by the individual, or the domination of individuals by larger social wholes and their requirements. It is not, in Hegel, that the logical insufficiency is said to be *responsible* for the practical experience of unfreedom. (This is again the mistake about Hegel that Marx kept making.) Rather, *both* reflect the same incomplete level of self-understanding, and so both are, to revert to the image used earlier, two sides of the same coin. In its full Hegelian flourish, the claim is for an identity of the Idea of the True and the Idea of the Good in the Absolute Idea.

LIFE AS A LOGICAL CONCEPT

The Problem of Life

In the relevant section of the logic of the Concept, Hegel appears to go far beyond Kant in his *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, when he claims that we know just from general reflection on rendering anything intelligible that in such a rendering there is, must be, a distinction between living and nonliving beings. While the claim that there are detectable empirical differences between what seem to be living and nonliving beings is an ordinary claim, of no particular philosophical significance, the claim that there is an *irreducible* difference between living and nonliving beings, that the distinction is necessary, or that the norms of explicability for nonliving beings cannot be invoked to account for living beings, is a philosophical claim, for which there is no empirical court of appeal.¹ Life is a pure concept; that is, this categorical distinction is not empirically discoverable. If we are restricted to empirical experience alone, we find no categorical difference between an iron blade rusting in the moist air and a plant dying for lack of water. Explaining the two events empirically would have the same logical form (and, as we have seen, for Hegel this is equivalent to saying that *the events* have the same form).

1. Cf. Kreines's (2015, 78) formulation. However, Kreines's general contrast in metaphysics between "substrate" and "explainers" can sometimes leave the impression that the status of explainers like internal purposiveness amounts to something like Kant's subjective necessity. See: "All of that is supposed to bring us to the point of seeing that *we need* genuinely inner purposiveness if the concept is to do the work of explaining the possibility of change" (217, my emphasis).

Hegel insists otherwise. In the latter case, the plant is said “not to agree with its concept,” not to be functioning as a plant should, and that claim involves a different logical form. (There are of course many contemporary philosophers who see no problem in not being able to make this distinction, because they think that there is no distinction, that reference to “how the plant should function” is not a useful or even a genuine scientific concept.)

As a consequence of this exploration of logical form alone, we are supposed to know that there must be forms of thought specific to self-organized beings, to perceiving and desiring self-organized beings, and to self-conscious and rational perceiving and desiring self-organized beings, or to plants, animals, and human animals. We know what it is to be a living being in a way that cannot depend on discovering this empirically. So how do we know it?

We should first note the difficulty of stating this project correctly. First, just as Kant did not attempt to deduce the necessary existence of events in causal relations, but sought to show that any event that did exist must stand in a necessary relation to some prior event, and just as Kant did not try to deduce the necessary existence of living beings, but tried to show that any world that required mechanistic explanations of what exists, or any world in which change is a matter of efficient causation, must also allow, cannot rule out, that there are changes like gestation, birth, growth, reproduction, disease, and death, which cannot be properly accounted for by the logical form appropriate for nonliving beings, so Hegel is not out to deduce a priori the necessary existence of living beings, but has an ambition similar to Kant’s (that is, such changes cannot be properly accounted for by the logical form appropriate for nonliving beings) but much greater because Hegel denies that teleological explanations are merely subjectively necessary. The Hegelian version of that argument form is something like: in order for thinking to be a possibly veridical thinking of anything, which for Hegel is the same condition as, in order for being to be determinately anything at all, discriminable as what it is, it must be qualitatively predicable and quantitatively predicable, the relation between quantitative alteration and qualitative change must be determinable, and therewith a distinction between appearance and essence must be makeable . . . and so on through the objective logic. That is obviously quite a task, and goes part of the way in explaining the denseness of the enterprise.

This is what generates a task that is more ambitious than delimiting the features of *that* special logical form required for the intelligibility of living beings or actions or human practices. This is the complicated task Michael

Thompson set for himself in his book *Life and Action*.² That project has yielded important results, especially in showing that the species universality of living beings cannot be understood in the post-Fregean understanding of universal quantification. “Wolves hunt in packs” cannot mean that for all *X*, if *X* is a wolf, *X* hunts in packs. Wolves do hunt in packs, but if, for various ecological reasons, many wolves, perhaps even *all* remaining wolves, cannot any longer hunt in packs, they are clearly still wolves, and it still remains universally true that “wolves hunt in packs.”³ But Hegel wants also to show much more. For one thing, this clarification of form does not address the question Kant raised in the third *Critique*: granted there are these logical differences that we appeal to in distinguishing living beings and their species universality, what is the status of the categorical differences? Does the form designate a realm of being explicable only by appeal to such a form? Hegel answers yes to the last question; he claims that such distinctive conceptual forms have a necessity that *descends* from a general inquiry into the intelligibility of objects at all. The argument is that objects and events would not be available to us in their full intelligibility if the distinction between living and nonliving could not be made. This means that accounts given of nonliving beings would be insufficient on their own terms without a distinction between living and nonliving. In the terms of the logic of the Concept where the concept of life appears, he means to show that there could not be adequate mechanistic and chemical and “external” teleological explanations (say, the production of an artifact guided by a maker’s representation) without the contrasting distinction with living beings, without, following Kant’s terms, “internal” teleology. (That is, a case where an element is for the sake of the whole without its being the — impossible — case that the element or part intends to be for the whole, and without reference to any designer’s intention).⁴ His unusual thesis is that teleology is “the truth of mechanism.” That is, mechanistic explanations are domain specific, and so represent an

2. Michael Thompson 2008.

3. Hegel wants this distinction too, which he calls one between “the concept of reason” and a “concept of the understanding which relates itself to the particular only by subsuming this particular which it does not have in itself” (EL §204A).

4. This is so even if, thanks to some catastrophe, there were to be no living beings in existence anymore. Hegel is explicit that the purposiveness Kant wants to defend need not require any “representation” or efficient causality of the concept (EL §204A). Predictably, he claims that Aristotle already showed that such internal purposiveness did not require “caused by a representation,” and that Kant, despite his hedging and qualification, “re-awakened” (*wieder erweckt*) the Aristotelian understanding of inner purposiveness.

abstraction from a more comprehensive and complex domain that includes subjective or intentional teleology and objective teleology in organic beings.⁵

Hegel is fully aware of the skepticism that his proposal will encounter:

The idea of life has to do with a subject matter so concrete, and if you will so real, that in dealing with it one may seem according to the common notion of logic to have overstepped its boundaries. (12.179)⁶

The “Logic” of Life

As we have seen, for Kant, the actual rather than suggested bearing of the form of any possible thought on the form of any possible object required appeal to some way of determining a priori the form of our receptive capacities, an a priori way of appealing to what is other than thought. This is so because Kant thought that thinking alone had no receptive access to reality, and that our only access was through sensible affection. Since this access is possible a priori, since there are *pure* forms of sensible intuition, there can be a transcendental deduction establishing the objective validity of the categories, that is, their being the forms of objects, at least objects of sensible experience. For Hegel, by contrast, the final step would be rightly formulated as: the conceptual forms required for the unity of judgment are, at the same time, the forms necessary for *any* object determinacy. The forms of thought are the forms of being.

As we have also seen, Hegel famously thought that when Kant attempted to show the bearing of these conceptual powers on the form of objects, his appeal to such subjective forms of intuition inevitably “psychologized” the results, limited them to our species, and generated an unacceptable (even “absurd”) thesis about the unknowability of things in themselves. Such an appeal was not necessary. There were no pure, subjective forms of sensible intuition. Hegel relocated any question about space and time to the Philosophy of Nature, or to a philosophical reflection on the scientific treatment of space and time. Positively, this rejection amounted to the claim that, properly understood, pure thinking’s investigation of itself could, all on its own, establish the form of objects. Everything, of course, depends on “properly understood.” Here again are the passages that have served us as touchstones throughout this essay:

5. See deVries 1991, 60.

6. In the older Hegel literature (Lasalle, Michelet, Rosenkranz), this was addressed as the problem of the “Logizität” of Mechanism and Chemism and Teleology within the *Logic*. See Hogemann’s (1994, 92ff.) summary.

Thus *logic* coincides with *metaphysics*, with the science of *things* grasped in *thoughts*, which used to be taken to express the *essentialities of the things*. (EL §24)

And

The objective logic thus takes the place rather of the former metaphysics which was supposed to be the scientific edifice of the world as constructed by thoughts alone. (SL 21.48)

Essentially, what happens in the logic of the Concept is that the notion of the concept, now the “object” of our inquiry, in the claim that “the truth of the object is its concept” will acquire a more complex logical structure, ultimately a systematic structure, as in the systems of mechanism and chemism. And ultimately our penultimate topic, “The Idea of Cognition” (*die Idee der Erkenntnis*), will offer the final metalevel understanding of the Concept as the ground of all cognition, the Concept as cognition itself.

Objectivity in the Subjective Logic

Before we proceed to the specific notion of life and a further comparison of Kant and Hegel, we need to locate that discussion within the development of mechanism and chemism “toward” subjective teleology, which will provide the ground of the transition to life, and then as its own topic within the development of the Absolute Idea. Life is said to be the “immediate” manifestation of the Idea. Life will reveal at an initial level the true unity of subjectivity and objectivity. This is said in the sense in which even plants, for Hegel, have “subjectivity” even as objects. Their growth and nutrition cannot be comprehended adequately as just the product of mechanical forces. Each can be said to “direct” the course of its life as it requires; each has an inner distinct from an outer, where this does not just mean inside as opposed to outside its surface.⁷ This in turn is linked to Hegel’s treatment of the Absolute Idea itself, which we have provisionally suggested should be understood as the pure concept of conceptuality, or the final self-determination by pure thinking of intelligibility itself, now as the unity of Subjectivity and Objectivity, a claim

7. See Pinkard (2012) for more. For example: “In the Hegelian view, there is a normativity already at work in nature in the sense that for organic life, there can be goods and evils for plants and animals—and thus reasons for plants and animals to respond in one way or another” (26); and see Pinkard’s valuable collection of relevant passages (34n12).

he glosses in terms that have become familiar here: the Concept finally giving itself its own content.⁸

I suggested in the previous chapter that having shown the truth of the object in self-consciousness, in conceptuality, Hegel proposes to investigate the concept in that status, now understood as being-true, or in its being the ground of the intelligibility of the object. As he says, now “the concept determines itself as objectivity” (21.127).⁹ This begins after a consideration of the concept in its pure formality, in the structure of concept, judgment, and syllogism. This then suggests the question of the world of objects, of “the truth,” of being-in-and-for-itself, already reflected in the truth-preserving inferential structure of such a syllogistic. To have reached this stage, presupposing everything that has gone before, is to see the logic of the relation among concepts in judgments and of judgments in inferential syllogistic relations as comprehending objects and their interrelations as explicable in a *system*. (This point was made by Kant in the first *Critique* in the transcendental dialectic. Real explicability would be a system of causal laws, supporting robust counterfactuals and necessary inferences. Of course, all of this was a regulative ideal, and Hegel’s treatment is very different, but the theme of full comprehension as full systematicity is one they share.) At such a point, we will have fleshed out considerably the “object’s being its concept” in a much fuller logical system of judgmental interrelations, systematically, and a modally robust one, prescribing what must and cannot happen under this or that condition. In this fuller systematic picture, we need a determinate

8. Any object can be said to be perpetually “becoming its concept,” where we mean to point out that the specification of any such concept requires understanding its role in “the Concept,” conceptuality itself. A living thing can be said to have such a moment “for itself” in Hegel’s terminology.

9. Hegel’s alternate way of making this point can be quite confusing. The point, I mean, is still the general one about the identity of logic and metaphysics, conceptuality and being, the forms of thought and the forms of objects, and so forth. We have determined a priori, purely by pure thinking, what being must be to be the intelligible being it is. One could say that this “transition is essentially the same as the proof from the concept, that is, the concept of God, to his existence,” which Hegel calls the “so-called ontological proof” (21.127). But he quickly makes clear that *his* transition to “objectivity” is quite a different matter, and that the concept of empirical existence (“sensible, perishable and temporal existence”) at issue in the ontological proof is a crude misapprehension of the nature of the problem. We get a further, fuller sense of the metaphorical nature of Hegel’s theological language when he tells us that what we have been reading about pure thinking’s movement, the “exposition of the pure concept,” is the “absolute, divine concept itself,” “the logical course of God’s self-determination as being” (21.129). He then hastens to note that *he* means by God what he takes up as “the idea.”

characterization of the norm, comprehensibility, as such. Such a norm or pure concept of genuine understanding will tell us what a thing is in terms of its relevant relational properties. As in what is presupposed and what follows about such relationality in designations like: Copper's melting point is 1083 degrees Celsius.

That determinate norm of comprehensibility is what is introduced by the pure concept Mechanism — more broadly in the claim that true comprehensibility is and is only mechanistic, paradigmatically Newtonian mechanics.¹⁰ Yet again, it is this sort of overreach that reveals the limitations and incompleteness of such a norm of comprehensibility. This is the first, immediate, simplest manifestation of the a priori claim to a norm for determinate explicability. Hegel spells out its conditions.

The differentiated moments [the units of comprehension] are complete and self-subsistent objects that, consequently, even in connection relate to one another as each standing on its own, each maintaining itself in every combination as external. — This is what constitutes the character of mechanism, namely, that whatever the connection that obtains between the things combined, the connection remains one that is alien to them, that does not affect their nature. (12.133)

This is essentially a “billiard balls” model of moving and inertial forces, in which there is what Hegel continually calls “an indifference” in the relation among objects. And therein will lie its chief problem.

That is, the indifference of objects external to each other, or comprehended only as matter moving and colliding in space, means that there is no real explanation for what happens, just a formalization of what happens.¹¹ There is no way (except pragmatically or “subjectively” for Hegel) to select in or out the *relevant* relations among such indifferent objects, and we will

10. Hegel's account would have perhaps been much different had he paid more attention on the issue of mechanism to Leibniz on continuously flexible matter, and especially his account of material that reveals a teleological capacity to “remember” its “natural state” (e.g., a spring “remembers” its shape when compressed or stretched, or billiard balls can be said to “desire” to return to their natural spherical shape after suffering slight indentations upon collision). He would have thus seen another strategy for denying an absolute distinction between mechanism and teleology, or could have appreciated how “indifference” cannot be assumed to be the chief characteristic of mechanism, as he claimed. I owe my sense of the importance of this Leibnizean point to Mark Wilson (2018).

11. Kreines (2015, chap. 2) is helpful on the indifference issue.

find instead that we are awash in infinite contingency, with no real ground for our isolation of the relevant units of comprehension. (At least no ground until we are able to introduce reference to what in an object's nature makes its relation with other objects impossible, possible, or necessary. This will be chemism.)¹² We will see more of this in the account of life itself, but here is Hegel's summary:

Dead mechanism was the mechanical process of objects above considered that immediately appeared as self-subsisting, but precisely for that reason are in truth nonself-subsistent and have their center outside them; this process that passes over into rest exhibits either contingency and indeterminate difference or formal uniformity. This uniformity is indeed a rule, but not law. (12.146)

Chemism does make such an appeal to the internal properties, the chemical properties, to explain why some chemical compounds are possible and others are not. Objects considered chemically are not "indifferent" but determine their relationality as dependent on the kind they are.

The chemical object is distinguished from the mechanical in that the latter is a totality indifferent to determinateness, whereas in the chemical object the determinateness, and hence the reference to other, and the mode and manner of this reference, belong to its nature. (12.148)

At this point, in a set of remarks I still find obscure, Hegel argues that this mini-ascent to greater degrees of internal determination of external relationality gives rise logically to the idea of purpose. Sodium does not have as its purpose "to form an ionic compound with chloride," but the chemical nature of sodium and of chloride will allow us to understand their combinability, and that result seems to inspire the thought of an even more determinate transcendence of mere indifference. Not only would this involve attention, say, to the biochemical reactions in the kidney's functioning, but these reactions would then be tied in *their* comprehensibility to the kidney's *purpose*. Such a further transcendence of indifference provided by the general notion

12. "The chemical object is distinguished from the mechanical in that the latter is a totality indifferent to determinateness, whereas in the chemical object the determinateness, and hence the reference to other, and the mode and manner of this reference, belong to its nature" (12.148).

of purpose would then count as an initial or immediate form of true “self-determination,” not an indifferent or merely external “determination by an other.”

Overall, it is possible to get a general sense of what he means by this hierarchy of adequacy. When we say that average acceleration over a period of time is its change in velocity divided by the duration of the period, or when we say that the hydrogen and oxygen molecules combined to form water, or when we say that that clock functions poorly, or that wolf is deformed, these are not empirical distinctions within a common notion of comprehensibility. In Hegel’s language, they are objective aspects of the logical distinctions between immediacy, mediation, and self-mediation necessary for all objective intelligibility, and this order manifests *ever greater possible comprehensibility* in these terms. This moves us closer to life as a concept, the first manifestation of unity of concept and reality as purpose (and so the immediate manifestation of the idea). A living being’s concept is not external to it as a particular being. That particularity is essentially nothing other than the becoming of its concept. The concept is internal to its nature, and that nature is self-determining, not determined from without. (Hence the claim that life is the first, immediate manifestation of the Absolute Idea, the unity of subjectivity and objectivity.)¹³

This is clearly where we are headed, but Hegel’s discussion here introduces that idea of purposiveness in a more indirect way that seems to diverge from the account of the logic of comprehensibility. He discusses first just the logical relations inherent in *subjective purposiveness*, an intelligence setting an end and pursuing that end by the appropriate means. This would already introduce the idea of a unity of self-determination or subjectivity with objectivity—with the physical, chemical means, which, as efficient causes, are taken up as such means within a subjectively determined purpose. But it (artifactual making and so subjective end setting) seems oddly illustrative, used to make a point in preparation for the account of living beings; such artifactual teleology seems not to be developed internally from some determinate, internal deficiency of chemism.

He begins to explain what he seems to have in mind in general by noting that mechanism and chemism are themselves pure concepts, products of pure thinking. Each is an all-inclusive *theory* of true comprehensibility, and

13. “Internal” and “self-determined” obviously, in this context, do not refer to “conscious” or metaphysically autonomous.

as “pure thinking” each obviously requires a that-which-thinks, or a subject, one that sets the end of explicability and judges the theory’s sufficiency in accordance with that end. (This is meant not as a species characteristic but as a requirement on “any thinker.”) Since, as we saw in the previous chapter, thinking for both Kant and Hegel is itself purposive, mechanism can be said in this sense to presuppose subjective teleology, a living being that can set ends, for example, the end of understanding. Such a capacity, to set and pursue ends, already presupposes a living being who can set such ends. However, such a reference to the purposiveness of the thinker is available at any point in the *Logic*’s development and does not seem internally related to chemism. What will eventually make Hegel’s account so ambitious is that he treats this requirement—that objects and events would not be available to us in their full intelligibility, if the distinction between living and nonliving could not be made—not as telling us something merely about us, about our requirements, but as a claim about the real distinction between living and nonliving beings. And so in this case too, we return to the familiar claim: the forms of thought are the forms of being.

Thus the idea is, first of all, life. It is the concept which, distinct from its objectivity, simple in itself, permeates that objectivity and, as self-directed purpose, has its means within it and posits it as its means, yet is immanent in this means and is therein the realized purpose identical with itself.

(12.177)

Now, a simple way to sum all of this up, however misleading, would be to say that for Hegel life is an objectively necessary pure concept because we know that mechanism is such a concept, and that chemism is, and that artifactual teleology is, and that these pure concepts are incomplete without teleological concepts, ultimately the concept of living organisms. And of course mechanism et al. are objectively necessary because they are necessary implications of the failure of mere “Being” to be a thought, and of the consequent determinations of the discursive possibilities necessary for thought to be possibly truth-bearing, to be of an object. This of course is hardly an adequate summary of a comprehensible argument. For one thing, the argument stretches hundreds and hundreds of pages, every moment of which must be held to this kind of overarching criterion. This would require a commentary at least ten times as large as the *Logic*. But there are, I hope, moments of illumination in what Hegel is trying to say that can stand relatively on their own.

Kant and the Problem of Life

These general characteristics of Hegel's project, and the specific movement through the objectivity section, bear directly on Hegel's treatment of the concept of life and, yet again, on what has always seemed to me the clearest way, by both contrast and comparison, to clarify his position—its relation to Kant, in this case Kant's position in the *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. The kinship is clear. In Kant's theory of experience, there is nothing in experience that would distinguish living beings from nonliving. And the concept is not an idea of reason, not derivative from the regulative ideal of a substantial soul, an unconditioned for a series, or a necessary being (at least it is not arrived at in the same way). Rather it is relevant for the faculty he is exploring in this *Critique*—judging. That is, it is necessary for the actualization of a conceptual power—judging—in one domain not tied to, dependent on, sensible experience.

But the contrast with Hegel is also obvious. Kant argues that we must *conceive* living beings as a distinct ontological kind, requiring an internal teleological explanation that is irreducible to mechanistic explanation. This appears to mean many things to Kant: that the known properties of matter, even in his dynamical conception, cannot account for the organization and unity of some beings, living beings; that while efficient causal explanations are possible for such beings, those causal laws could not explain their living nature, that their parts are the parts they are only within some whole and that the parts are interrelated and require a relation to other parts; that while efficient causation can explain how the whole depends on the parts, it cannot explain how the parts depend on the whole. But he also insists that we cannot know that the beings we pick out as falling under this category *really are* the living, internally self-organizing beings that we, with “subjective” necessity, take them to be. As we have already seen, Kant distinguishes, and Hegel praises him for doing so, between an element in a complex that is purposive because it satisfies the ends of the designer or maker, like a radiator in a car, or external purposiveness, and an element the purposiveness of which is determined not by any appeal to an external designer, but rather “internally” in an organic self-organizing and self-maintaining whole. We explain the parts by reference to this whole, which itself is, reciprocally, the reason the parts are as they are; and all of this without any intention of the parts, such as organs, to represent anything as their end. So, for example, we can say what leukocytes, white blood cells, are for, without reference to a designer of the system,

but by reference to the internal ends of the living being, such as maintaining health by attacking foreign invaders like bacteria or parasites. As Kant says, we can show that the parts of a living being “as far as their existence and their form are concerned are possible only through their relation to the whole.”¹⁴

But, again, this is all a matter of what *we must think* for the sake of a satisfying explanation. Our empirical experience, according to Kant, does not allow a truly objective categorical or generic distinction between our iron blade rusting and plant dying. They obey exactly the same laws of nature. All we *know* is that any change is connected with necessity to some other event, and, if we are ambitious Kantians, that particular changes are tokens of type-type causal laws about events. The unusual causal order required by internal teleology—that the effect of some cause is also the cause of that cause (that the effect of the activities of leukocytes, attacking and destroying foreign invaders, is the cause of there being such leukocytes)—is merely a subjective heuristic. It must be *merely* that because the formulation just given about teleological causality makes no sense in the scientific terms Kant considers himself to have established. “It is entirely contrary to the nature of physical-mechanical causes that the whole should be the cause of the possibility of the causality of the parts” (*KU* 20: 236).¹⁵ He tells us in §65 that this final causality, as causality, is scientifically (i.e., within the domain of knowledge proper) unintelligible, and could be made intelligible only if matter itself were alive (which he calls *hylozoism*),¹⁶ or if we conjoined to nature a designing soul, thus contradicting the assumption of a *self*-organizing nature, and committing us to something we have no right to assume. “Strictly speaking, therefore, the organization of nature has nothing analogous to any causality known to us.”¹⁷ So while Kant has many other compelling things to say about the incompatibility of mechanistic explanation and teleological explanation (such as reference to a “formative force” that mechanism cannot account for), and about the impossibility of life’s originating from the attractive and repulsive motions of matter, it is this assumption that explanation proper is causal, and that for living beings this would require an impossibility, something that is cause and effect of itself, that he seems to think is decisive.

But all of this is supposed to be consistent with the *unavoidability* of tele-

14. Kant 2000, 245.

15. Kant 2000, 36.

16. There are some who believe Hegel is committed to such a claim. See Düsing 1986. As is obvious, I think this mislocates the metaphysical import of the science of pure thinking.

17. Kant 2000, 246.

ological explanations, that is, with their necessity. It is not simply up to us, arbitrarily, whether we explain things mechanically or in terms of natural purposiveness, whether we find it convenient or useful or not. The category is not a mere heuristic, and it is not conceptually conceivable that we are just “for this moment in history” *as yet* unable to appeal to the properties of matter or to the form of mechanistic explanation. He asserts as a philosophical truth that we will never be able to do so, and even that it is “absurd” to imagine that we could. (No “Newton for a blade of grass,” ever.) He says clearly that we can *no more* give up the teleological principle and the idea of final causality than we can give up the universal causal principle itself (although the reasons for such impossibility are different). One brief reason he gives for this is that this abandonment would leave us without anything “for guidance in observing.”¹⁸ Since we could certainly discover intricate chains of efficient causal relations, say, the biochemical cause-and-effect relations that occur at the microbiological level when leukocytes are at work, he must mean that thereby we would not understand what we are observing, would not even be able to say that the leukocytes are failing when they do fail, would not know what to look at, how to organize the units of explanation. If we take this at face value, on its own it is hardly a dispositive argument. We could simply admit this but argue that a sick body and a healthy body obey the same physical laws and that the distinction between sick and healthy is one imported just because of our interests. It has nothing to do with “observing” itself.¹⁹

But Kant may well have in mind a stronger claim or several related claims. While we have the possibility of a physical and chemical account of cell division, we are not observing a mere series. With that account alone, we would have no way of understanding that these processes are part of one series, no way to isolate anything like “what is to come next” and so no language to explain what happens when it does not, and we would be assimilating the processes occurring in one form, cell division in a plant, say, and in another form altogether, in an animal, say. This notion of an insufficiency in accounting for the observed will play an important role later.

Inspired by such considerations, Kant keeps doubling down on his claims about necessity. In the antithesis of the antinomy of teleological judgment, which Kant, in his solution to the antinomy, wants to affirm, he says unqualifiedly that “some products of material nature *cannot be judged to be possible*

18. Kant 2000, 269, 270.

19. Kant’s general line of argument could be accused of circularity. See Zuckert 2007, 96.

in terms of merely mechanical laws. *Judging* them requires a quite different causal law—viz., that of final causes.”²⁰ Here the claim seems to run through a claim about the requirements of judgment (rather than mere understanding), and a presupposed claim about the necessity of judgment.

To add to the puzzle, although he also says such things as that the concept of final causality “*does indeed have objective reality*,” it is nevertheless “inadequate for dogmatic determinations” and “we have nothing that could assure us that the concept has objective reality.”²¹

The simple conjunction of a claim about what we must think (even to “observe” nature), and a claim about what we do not and cannot ever know—that nature is as we must think it to be—is the sort of thing that always deeply frustrated Hegel, and did so from his earliest Jena years (in *Glauben und Wissen*, for example). For one thing, the idea that we are required to believe something that doesn’t make any scientific sense, that science will never understand organic beings as such,²² is an insult to our rational nature, and the claim that we do not and never will really know that there are living beings, or that the very concept is not something we ever truly understand, is equally offensive.²³ The promise of the earlier claims we have summarized is that if we have understood properly what it is to claim that we cannot help making a distinction between living and nonliving, then we have established a metaphysical conclusion, not something essentially about us, about the human cognitive capacities. A typical remark from the *Logic*, cited earlier as an epigram:

Critical philosophy did indeed already turn *metaphysics* into *logic* but, like the subsequent idealism, it gave to the logical determinations an essentially subjective significance out of fear of the object. (21.35)

(This last can sound like a strange rhetorical reference to Kant’s psychology, but it is a measure of Hegel’s frustration with Kant that Kant can say such

20. Kant 2000, 258–59.

21. Kant 2000, 268.

22. In addition, as deVries (1991, 54) points out, Kant’s stricture would mean we could never be said to know any intentional or psychological phenomena at all, not to mention self-knowledge. We could not even claim to know what knowledge is, as Kant obviously wants.

23. See the formulation in the logic of the Concept: “Would anyone have ever thought that philosophy would deny truth to intelligible entities on the ground that they lack the spatial and temporal material of the senses?” (12.23).

things as “even empirical cognition of their cause and effect presupposes concepts of reason”²⁴ and yet still insist on the “essentially subjective significance” of this necessity.)

Hegel's Objections to “Subjective Necessity”

Even from this breathless summary, it should be clear enough that there is a general and quite similar project shared by both philosophers. An abstract formulation of that project would be a systematic determination of *what* reason requires of itself, “moments” without which reason would not be reason. (As we have seen, in the published introduction to the third *Critique*, Kant even coined a name for this norm, to accompany autonomy and heteronomy: *heautonomy*, although he does not thereafter take it up.) The disagreement concerns the status of the results: merely subjectively necessary, or of objective metaphysical significance?

For both, reason's main activity consists in its forms of inference, an activity that can proceed from, but is not tied to, the results of empirical experience. In all contexts, thinking's productive power is self-determining, and, as Hegel sometimes says, “free,” on its own. For both thinkers, our point of orientation is syllogistic, and we should ask what such syllogistic activity, given an exfoliation of its basic forms, suggests about where we are led when our intellectual power reaches substantive results on its own all extending Kant's basic clue about the relation between the forms of thought and the forms of objects.

According to Kant, we are led astray. The form of the categorical syllogistic inference grounds a “paralogistic” inference to an immaterial substance, a soul, or Cartesian mind, as the ground of thought. The hypothetical syllogism requires of us an antinomial inference to the unconditioned ground of a sequence or series. And the form of the disjunctive syllogism itself leads to the postulation of an absolutely necessary being.

Hegel's invocation of syllogistic, while it is the orienting beginning of the logic of the Concept, and so while it recalls Kant's orientation in the *Dialectic*, proceeds differently in its details. But, as we have seen, Hegel is interested also in what the inferential forms of relations among judgments imply about the “objective” manifestations of such forms, and all of this amounts to the extraordinarily ambitious goal of showing that mechanism itself already pre-

24. Kant 2000, 242.

supposes teleology which presupposes living beings. To review: he begins with reason's requirements on explanation as mechanism, the form according to which relations among objects are established, but "the diverse parts behave indifferently to each other, and their linkage is only external to them" (EL §194Z). (Moving matter in motion.) What he tries to show is that mechanism as a principle, as a pure or logical principle (rather than any first-order empirical discovery about the world), already amounts to, implicitly, what is most distinctive about teleology, an "explanation by concept," how a thing "matches up" to its concept, although in mechanism this concept is only "in itself," not "for itself." That is, mechanism presupposes its appropriateness and the demarcation of the domain of its appropriateness, and this is a normative suitability that will become more explicit, more for-itself, as the limitations of mechanism and the restrictions of this domain are thought through. This form or concept, he shows, cannot cover relations that are not so wildly contingent, but ordered according to the natures of the elements, where objects are "essentially differentiated," so that the objects "are what they are only in their relation to each other" (ibid.). That is, his claim is that while mechanism posits a radical independence among objects in motion, the results of mechanism itself reveal a regular dependence, fixed and unvarying, among such putative independent objects, and it must transform itself into a position that can do this justice, not treat it as an astonishing accident. He tries to connect this form and its transition to syllogistic form, but here, and throughout, that seems more a gloss on this underlying argument about independence and dependence (see EL §198).²⁵ He calls this transformation of mechanism into something in which its concept of itself is more but not fully explicit, or for itself, "chemism" and is thinking of chemical compounds.

But there are also explicable relations that are both external and mechanical but uniquely suited by their natures for other elements, like the gears of a watch. He wants to say that the two forms, mechanism and chemism, on their own generate this joint possibility, elements both external to one another and yet not "indifferent" to each other, and that it is a possibility wherein the role of the concept of the thing is more explicit and more implicitly invoked in explanation than in the prior two modalities ("because it is a watch and should keep accurate time," in explaining a gear). In his terms,

25. This is clearest when he is talking about external or artifactual teleology. Here is a goal (major term), an intention to pursue the goal (minor term), and a means to actualize the intention (middle term).

not always the most helpful, the simple immediacy of the elements has been denied, and all the elements are now to be understood as “what they actually are” only in relation to each other *and the whole*, viz., the artifact’s concept. He then tries to show how such an external relation of concept to explanation (by reference to a maker) already contrasts with a being whose ends are internal to it by its nature, not by an external source, and this initially defines for him a living being. He ultimately wants to show the connection between such living beings and beings that can set and pursue ends, or animal life.

Now all of these transitions are supposed to be internal to the conceptual moment under interrogation, so Hegel has a different and stronger notion of the necessity of what reason requires of itself than Kant, and in section 3 above, we explored that idea. But we have enough in view to make our final comparison and contrast with Kant.

One way of summarizing what we have been looking at is this. It is not correct to say that Hegel is arguing that we *do* know a priori what Kant insisted we could only think with subjective necessity. This characterization would require that Hegel, contrary to Kant, thought that we could provide content for pure concepts, that we could establish somehow, without any deduction, what we need to establish: that there are in fact objects in conformity with what pure, in themselves empty, concepts require. But as we have seen, Hegel does not accept Kant’s claim that pure concepts are “empty,” and so Kant’s claim that a link, a second step, is necessary to “connect” such concepts with objects. That emptiness claim depends on a substantive thesis about pure forms of intuition, and is not internal to a science of pure thinking. Pure thinking’s determination of the necessary moments of possible conceptual determinacy are just thereby a specification of objects in their knowability. *If* there is a way to determine internally such elements of conceptual determinacy, no “second step” is necessary. Such a determination would be at the same time a determination of objects in their possible knowability. We are at the point where Hegel is trying to show that mechanism, as a pure concept, cannot be the last step in the internal self-determination by pure thinking of itself.

But one more dimension of Kant’s treatment is necessary for us to take the full measure of Hegel’s divergence from Kant. We need to return briefly to a Kantian topic discussed previously in chapter 6.

Recall that when Kant specified why there must be reliance on the concept of life, even for empirical cognition, or why there must be this “determination by concepts,” he put the matter in a way that reminds us of the

subject matter of the book. He said, “some products of material nature *cannot be judged to be possible* in terms of merely mechanical laws. *Judging* them requires a quite different causal law—viz., that of final causes.”²⁶ It is judging that uniquely requires what he claims is required. He is talking here not about judgment simply as logical synthesis, the claiming of what is the case, but about reflective judgment, the inferential faculty (or the distinctive function of reason in this context; there is only one intellectual faculty for Kant) that this *Critique* has discovered, and that gives us a way to pose Hegel’s problems with Kant’s very restricted notion of when an appeal to a concept can be said to ground a thing’s possibility.

Both parts of the *Critique of the Power of Judgment* are a critique of the reflective and determining functions of judgment. Kant’s official formulation is:

The power of judgment can be regarded either as a mere faculty for reflecting on a given representation, in accordance with a certain principle, for the sake of a concept that is thereby made possible, or as a faculty for determining an underlying concept through a given empirical representation. In the first case it is the reflecting, in the second case the determining power of judgment. To reflect (to consider), however, is to compare and to hold together given representations either with others or with one’s faculty of cognition, in relation to a concept thereby made possible.²⁷

As with virtually everything else we have touched on, this is a claim worthy of much more attention, but for our purposes, we need only the following summary, which can set out a larger context for the issue already discussed in chapter 6.

In early 1789 Kant began to formulate the new problem of reflective judgment, as well as a new a priori principle for such a faculty, the purposiveness of nature. What is important to notice for our purposes is that with that development, the shape of the entire critical project began to change dramatically and a watershed historical moment occurred, one crucial to the development of later idealisms. The so-called “First Introduction” of May 1789 for the first time went far beyond a critique of taste. Kant had realized that something like the deep structure of judgments like “this rose is beauti-

26. Kant 2000, 259.

27. Kant 2000, 15.

ful” actually *contravened* its own surface structure, that the predicate “beautiful” was not really functioning as a standard predicate, as it appeared to. It referred to no objective property or mere secondary quality. Instead, he concluded, it involved a *nonconceptually guided* reflective activity on the part of the subject of the experience, whose novel logic required notions like a free play of the faculties, purposiveness without a purpose, disinterested pleasure, a commonsense and universal subjective validity. The realization of the distinct features of this reflective activity was only the beginning of a series of more strikingly novel claims of interest to us. That issue, he clearly thought, that intellectual activity, the reflective judging that resulted in aesthetic judgments, also constituted the basic structure of teleological judgments, and so could account for the unique intelligibility of organic beings. In something like the same way that the normal perceptual experience of flowers, vistas, and bird songs as suitable objects of empirical knowledge would in no way help us to understand why we find such objects beautiful, not to mention give us a right to claim that others ought to as well, likewise our normal empirical experience of plants and animals as such suitable objects of knowledge would in no way help us to understand that those objects were alive, and so possessed a distinct kind of unity of parts, and a ground for such a division of living from nonliving was necessary. But the faculty of reflective judging, he concluded, could explain such possibilities, how we are responsive to what experience requires of us, without its constraining that activity.

And then a number of other issues seemed to be thrown into the same reflective judgment pot. The formulation of scientific theories not fixed or determined by empirical generalizations involved this activity and its logic, as did the systematizing of empirical laws necessary for genuine scientific knowledge. Finally, even the determination of ordinary empirical concepts now seemed to require this newly formulated reflective capacity, and in all of these cases a kind of legitimating grounding could be given, not fully anticipated in the first *Critique*. So reflective judging and its a priori principle were now necessary not only for explaining the possibility and validity of aesthetic judgments, but in accounting for the necessary distinction between organic and nonorganic nature, the formation of empirical concepts, the proper integration of genera and species, the general unification of empirical laws into systems of scientific law, theory formation itself, and the right way to understand the attribution of a kind of necessity to all such principles, judgments, concepts, laws, and systems. The *Critique of Taste* had become the *Critique of the Power of Judgment*.

But, as with the “Ideas of Reason,” Kant continued to hold that such reflective judging was not constitutively necessary for *there being objects of experience* at all, and so could not properly be called cognition. That required only that we be able to distinguish a subjective succession of representations from an objective, something that was possible only if any event was necessarily connected to another prior event. But Kant himself seems to be conceding that that result alone amounts to an impoverished notion of cognition, *Erkenntnis*, and it seems arbitrarily restricted. We wouldn’t know much if we knew only that, without empirical concepts, laws, systems, and distinctions between living and nonliving. So all the above products of reflective judgment must count as necessary and indispensable, and in a way that is not just convenient, but nevertheless remains merely regulative. Given their necessity and indispensability, given how much we would miss in the world if we could not claim we know that things fall into kinds (that there are empirical concepts), that nature is law-governed with necessity, that species fall under genera, and that some beings are alive, the Hegelian question is: Why does Kant persist, even after the expansion of his system in the third *Critique*, in claiming that we do not really know any of these things, that we just require them of ourselves and can’t see a way to abandon such commitments?

One reason Kant continues to hold this has to do with how he understands the logical character of the difference between reflective and determining judgments themselves. But, as we saw, Hegel implies that the way Kant has described the situation—given a particular, find the universal—is misleadingly “external.” Any so-called ascent is not really external to the instance being reflected on. Any putative result must already be the “true being” (*eigentliches Seyn*) in the first place. The way this distinction is sketched, as one between a strictly separate determining judgment—the supposed application of a universal to a particular—and a reflective judgment, understood as “given a particular, find the universal,” is not credible. There is no way to understand the particular as “external” to the power of reflection like this. Independent of the determination by its concept, such a particular isn’t anything determinate at all; it provokes a search for its universal, on the assumption that it has not been classified as a kind, but there is nothing to guide or direct such a search. Distinguishing the relevant properties among the detectable properties cannot be accounted for in such a model. (Hence the similarity to the basic problem of essence in chapter 6.)

We should note again Hegel's formulation of that basic problem.

Reflection thus finds an immediate before it which it transcends and from which it is the turning back. But this turning back is only the presupposing of what was antecedently found. (11.252)

And,

This antecedent comes to be only by being left behind; its immediacy is sublated immediacy. — The sublated immediacy is, contrariwise, the turning back into itself, essence that arrives at itself, simple being equal to itself. This arriving at itself is thus the sublating of itself and self-repelling, presupposing reflection, and its repelling of itself from itself is the arriving at itself. (11.252)

Longuenesse has shown that judgment in the first *Critique*, often assumed to be purely determinative (as in the question of whether the categories “apply” to sensible objects), always also has a reflective character, in the manner suggested here.²⁸ But it is not clear from what she says how the two functions, “find the particular for the universal” and “find the universal for the particular,” are jointly active, rather than successive (something that would not make much sense). She also isolates the third *Critique* as concerned with “merely reflective judgments,” and this because the search for a universal fails. No determinate application, no determinative judgment, would be possible. Aesthetic reflective judgments give us only “purposiveness without a purpose.” But while it is true that teleological judgments can never arrive at a final purpose for nature as a whole, that does not mean that we cannot settle on, and then apply, determinate concepts of purpose for leukocytes, protoplasm, the liver, and so forth. So the question of their joint activity is just as pressing in the third *Critique* as it is in the first.

This can all sound like a puzzling circularity, but it bears directly on Kant's skepticism about the objectivity of the concept of life. For Kant, a living being requires us to think something we cannot, how the whole causes the parts that cause it. (He certainly agrees that this can make no sense; it is meant as a *reductio*.) But this simply assumes not just the *distinguishability* of

28. Longuenesse 1998, 163–66.

whole and parts but their temporal *separability*.²⁹ However, a living being's reproduction according to kind makes clear that in such reproduction there is no puzzle about the production of parts that make a whole possible that *then* also makes the parts possible by causing them. The generation of whole and parts is simultaneous, as in all cases of final causality. The reciprocal relation between whole and parts exists from the moment of conception, and the only real causation is efficient causation, internally in the organism's processes and generatively. These causal series, however, cannot explain reproduction according to kind, the unity of an organism, the regularity of the occurrences of the series, or even the lawfulness of nature. We therefore propose judgments about the series, we systematize the series in a way that need not presuppose a creator or bizarre temporal relations but must see them as rule-bound or norm-bound to avoid unmanageable contingency.³⁰ We have of course a much better understanding today of how the DNA "blueprint" is actualized, but the sequences alone still require us to think of what is happening as a defined process with a beginning and an end, as the

29. The best discussion of the importance of the temporal structure required by teleological judgments is Zuckert 2007. See p. 125 on "an entirely new form of causality" with "a different temporal form." But it can have such a form, contra Kant, without any suggestion of backward causation. That, at least, is how I am presenting Hegel's objection. As Zuckert shows (133 ff.), it is because Kant thinks that teleological judgment requires "a form of causality that does not meet the minimum criterion of causality (i.e. necessary temporal succession)" that the teleological invocation of purpose must remain merely regulative. This is no doubt what Kant thought, but Hegel's charge is that it begs the question about final cause explanation from the outset. Zuckert also argues that Kant thinks mechanism cannot account for the distinctive unity of heterogeneous parts typical of living beings. This is, she notes, different from Ginsborg's (2004) emphasis on mechanism's inability to account for the regularity and lawlike features of living processes. This is really a debate about which consideration was more decisive for Kant, but there seems to me evidence that Kant gave some weight to each consideration (and others), and it remains true that for Kant, when we do try to account for such regularity, we end up committed to a kind of causality and form of temporality that is inconsistent with what we could ever experience.

30. I am agreeing here with Ginsborg (2001).

This is what I think Kant has in mind when he says that the 'concept of connections and forms of nature according to purposes' serves as a principle 'for bringing nature's appearances under rules where the laws of causality according to the mere mechanism of nature do not suffice' (§ 61). It is only by interpreting organic phenomena in normative terms—as conforming (or failing to conform) to rules of the proper functioning of organic beings—that we can bring lawlike order to the otherwise incomprehensible diversity of the organic world. This is why we need the concept of purpose as a heuristic principle or guiding thread for the observation and investigation of organisms . . . independently of any questions that might be asked about how organisms came to be. (253)

The question for Kant remains why, if this is so, the teleological principle remains a heuristic.

growth of an individual of a kind. Thinking we can understand the parts causing the whole and in a separate moment, some sort of backward causation moment, the whole causing the parts is not the discovery of a solution to a problem but its question-begging invention, question-begging with regard to final-cause explanation that does not rely on a designer or on forward and backward causation. It is an explanation that explains by reference to a concept. ("Because that is what leukocytes are for.")³¹ Kant's argument is that we would not even understand what we were claiming unless we were making appeal to an entity "as if designed," but that argument rests on his invocation of a form of causality we cannot understand except by analogy with design according to concepts, and Hegel sees no reason for such a commitment in understanding living beings.³² There is a whole because of the parts by virtue of efficient causation. But there are parts because of the whole in a different sense of "because." The thing's concept is necessary for its specification as the thing-kind it is, and without this concept, we could not even identify the parts as parts. This is not an equivocation; it is doing justice to the two sorts of dependence in their joint realization.

Much of Hegel's relation to Kant's doctrines has just this air of reducing or eliminating oppositional tensions. The most famous in recent years has been the concept-intuition relation (again distinguishable but not separable) and the relation between pure practical reason and sensible inclination, which Hegel aspires in the same way to "unify" rather than oppose.

There is nonetheless a reasonable response from Kant or a Kantian. It concerns the status of a form of understanding "by reference to a concept" like the one above about leukocytes. Since the modern revolution in philosophy we have come to be skeptical about this, imagining someone answering the question, "Why did the book fall?" with "Because it is in the nature

31. There is a clear analysis of the importance of reproduction according to kind, and so "the intimate relation of taken and type," in Kreines (2015, 97–100). See also Kreines (2008) on the importance of Aristotle for Hegel's account.

32. See Ginsborg 1997, 332–33. As Ginsborg suggests, we could invoke "conformity to normative law" as what distinguishes teleological explanation without a commitment to an alien form of causality (339). This would still, for Kant, push the question back to a reformulation: whether such normativities are "real." For that, on Kantian premises, we would need to appeal to a nonmaterial substrate or a designing God, neither of which we will ever be entitled to. See Kreines 2015, 85–91. (I don't see that it would help Kant much to point out, as Kreines does [90], that Kant's skepticism can be stated without a global commitment to efficient causation, because he can appeal to a "supersensible real ground of nature." All that is knowable, however, is efficient causation, and that suffices to rule out *knowledge* of final causality.)

of heavy things to fall.” Or we think the questions are impossibly ambitious (“What is the natural end of human being?”) or too easy to abuse (“because she is a woman”). But bad applications don’t invalidate the notion.

Such bad examples do not rule out the prospect for a philosophical inheritance of such remarks by Aristotle as:

And since the existence of the thing must already be given, it is clear that the question must be *why the matter is so-and-so*. For instance, the question may be ‘Why are these things here a house?’ (And the answer is ‘Because what being is for a house belongs to them’), or it may be ‘Why is this thing here a man?’, or ‘Why is this body in this state a man?’ So what is sought is the *cause by which the matter is so-and-so, i.e. the form*. And that is the substance.³³

Hegel certainly signs on:

the nature, the specific essence, that which is truly permanent and substantial in the manifold and accidentality of appearance and fleeting externalization, is the concept of the thing, the universal which is present in it. (21.15)

One final comment. If the question we are left with is “What counts as satisfactory comprehension?” then any answer will require our exploration of the concept of comprehension. Only the concept of comprehension can explain what a comprehension is. Hegel’s unusual language about all this gets at something: the concept is self-determining; it gives itself its own actuality. As we have seen, it is a notion indispensable to properly philosophic comprehension and to questions about the nature of religion, or art, or thinking. There are no empirical answers to such questions, and it is dissatisfying to be told that we are asking a question about language, linguistic usage, meaning. No, we’re not. We are asking what art, what thinking, what being alive, and

33. Aristotle 1994a, 1041b3–8, my emphasis. Citing Aristotle, of course, does not settle anything philosophically, and the whole notion of “explanation by concept” requires, I am arguing, attention to the whole issue of the relation between logic and metaphysics. Kreines (2015) is interested in showing the importance of “explanatory sufficiency” in understanding the Kant-Hegel relation on metaphysics, and that is clarifying. But without a further account of what it means to explain by appeal to a concept, we are in danger of formulations like these. See Kreines 2008, 366.

so forth *are*. It is equally (and needlessly) dissatisfying to be told that any putative result has only a subjective necessity, that we still don't know what thinking or explaining, etc., really is. Only thinking can determine what it is to be thinking or, on this approach, what it is to be living. Philosophy cannot go on as philosophy in undue and unnecessary "fear of the object."

9

THE TRUE AND THE GOOD

The Concept of the Concept

The structure for our final topic in this investigation of Hegel's identification of speculative logic and metaphysics is neatly presented in this passage from the Encyclopedia Logic.

The idea, as a process, runs through three stages in its development. The first form of the idea is life, i.e. the idea in the form of immediacy. The second form is then that of the mediation or the difference [*Differenz*], and this is the idea as knowing which appears in the twofold shape of the theoretical and the practical idea. The process of knowing has, as its result, the restoration of the unity, enriched by the difference, and this yields the third form of the hereby absolute idea, the final stage of the logical process that proves itself to be at once the truly first and the only being-through-itself-alone [*nur durch sich selbst Seiende*]. (EL 215A)¹

That last unusual phrase refers to the autonomy of pure thinking, or to reason's self-authorization, and, as the title of this study reminds us, this is not an account of any special ontological domain or object, but is an account of the nature of all possible account-givings and thereby of anything that

1. Translation altered. Although that last phrase is difficult to translate, the use of "entity" for *Seiende* is quite misleading.

could be the subject of an account, or of being's intelligibility in itself. (In this sense, at this level of abstraction, the subject matter could be said to be the "shadow" of the contingent, empirical world.) The subject matter that will close the book is just this self-determination itself and its status, or logic as metaphysics, brought to full self-consciousness: the rendering intelligible of intelligibility itself. And in the *Science of Logic*, there is a final formulation of this identity claim.

The idea is the adequate concept, the objectively true, or the true as such. If anything has truth, it has it by virtue of its idea, or something has truth only in so far as it is idea. (12.173)

The initial explanation of the idea in the introductory section of the *SL* will allow us to see, if also a bit dimly at first, why life should be understood as the immediate manifestation of the idea in a way that will be more fully realized in the two modalities of knowing, and then realized as absolute idea.

But since the result now is that the idea is the unity of the concept and objectivity, the true, we must not regard it as just a goal which is to be approximated but itself remains always a kind of beyond; we must rather regard everything as being actual only to the extent that it has the idea in it and expresses it. It is not just that the subject matter, the objective and the subjective world, ought to be in principle congruent with the idea; the two are themselves rather the congruence of concept and reality; a reality that does not correspond to the concept is mere appearance, something subjective, accidental, arbitrary, something which is not the truth. (12.174)

The attempt in this study has been to explain everything "actual" as "having and expressing the idea" as that identity between logic and metaphysics, where logic is understood as self-constituting, and metaphysics as the account of the intelligibility of the world in the sense prominent in Aristotle.² It is also true, however, that this last *non*-correspondence of concept and reality takes in all of the finite world, the world we want to know and on which, in which, we act. There are degrees of intelligibility, and the intelligibility of objects that depend on various possible contingent dependencies and manifold relation to other objects is of a much lower degree than that of organic

2. Hence the unusual marriage between Kant and Aristotle in Hegel.

beings and, finally, of the concept itself. Quite usefully for our purposes later in this chapter, one of Hegel's main examples throughout the *SL* and in other works of "the concept in its actuality as idea" is the political state, no real instance of which fully realizes its concept, but any instance of which, if it is a state, is also "what it is" by means of its concept. Its being on the way to full realization and its already being an actual state are quite consistent, as we would expect in a modern Aristotelian.

The relationship between concept and individual, as explored in the last part of the life section, is supposed to have introduced us to the final exfoliation of that relationship itself, of conceptuality in the metaphysical sense—that a pure concept is not a class concept under which instances fall, but the "truth" of any object. In the simplest sense, organic beings reproduce according to kind; their life-activity in general, including reproduction, is "for" its concept, for its specific form of life, in the sense that such activity can go well or poorly. Because this process of striving self-realization is never more than this process but always in the process of living, a being's life is never simply "achieved." The life-form itself, the species, perdures beyond the death of any individual, and this will be a valuable element in understanding the absolute idea.

The idea, on account of its immediacy, has singularity for the form of its concrete existence. But the reflection within it of its absolute process is the sublating of this immediate singularity; thereby the concept, which as universality is in this singularity the inner, transforms externality into universality, or posits its objectivity as a self-equality. (12.177)³

A living being is "for" its kind (it does what it does to realize the life-form it is), and its mere individuality is "sublated." (No living being can lead its life as individually determined, as if everything about its life were "up to it." It is the life-form it is, the universal.)

3. Cf. also:

That is to say, the process of the genus in which the single individuals sublimate in one another their indifferent, immediate, concrete existence, and in this negative unity die away, has further the realized genus that has posited itself as identical with the concept for the other side of its product.—In the process of the genus, the isolated singularities of individual life perish; the negative identity in which the genus turns back into itself is on the one side the generation of singularity just as it is also, on the other side, the sublation of it—is thus the genus rejoining itself, the universality of the idea as it comes to be explicitly for itself. (12.191)

So in this sense, what specifies the realization of its life is always other than such an individual life—it must always work, strive to live—and in so being a manifestation of the idea at work becoming itself and already having become itself, being a living being, it introduces us to the structure of knowing, a striving self-realization that does not achieve what would be the end of such striving—complete wisdom—and that focuses self-conscious attention on this logical structure of our knowing, and how one comes to know it by working through the opposition and differentiation characteristic of the subject-object relation in its finitude. (This characteristic is what we know in knowing the Absolute Idea, not the completed knowledge of content. The “realm of shadows” metaphor is relevant again.) Life is presented as the model for understanding the object-concept relationship at the heart of knowing, since it is living being which, in its species form, can be said to self-determine the specific birth-nourishment-“irritability” (differential responsiveness to its environment)-growth-aging-death natural life cycle.

The identity of the idea with itself is one with the process; the thought that liberates actuality from the seeming of purposeless mutability and transfigures it into idea must not represent this truth of actuality as dead repose, as a mere picture, numb, without impulse and movement, as a genius [*Genius (sic)*] or number, or as an abstract thought; the idea, because of the freedom which the concept has attained in it, also has the most stubborn opposition within it; its repose consists in the assurance and the certainty with which it eternally generates that opposition and eternally overcomes it, and in it rejoins itself. (12.177)

It will be very important to note this strange-sounding process of “generating an opposition” and “eternally” overcoming it when we come to Hegel’s account of theoretical and practical knowledge. Each will have this same structure.⁴

4. We should also note how persistent and wide-ranging this core notion of “self-opposition” is in Hegel. Compare this remark from very early on, in the 1802/3 *Natural Law* essay. “This is nothing else but the performance, on the ethical plane, of the tragedy which the Absolute eternally enacts with itself, by eternally giving birth to itself into objectivity, submitting in this objective form to suffering and death, and rising from its ashes into glory” (NL 104). That we should take quite seriously Hegel’s intimation here and in many other places that there is no such thing as a deep and satisfying human reconciliation with the world has been argued by Pinkard (2012) and is characteristic of J. M. Bernstein’s Hegel interpretation.

Said in a more Aristotelian way, a living being's form, its principle of intelligibility, is its norm, not just a means of classification. This norm can be realized poorly or well. This is the way we should understand the relation between objects in general and the Concept. (This does not amount to any suggestion that Hegel thinks we should view everything as alive, because every being's truth is its concept. The domain of relevance implied by the results of the *SL* is first of all the domain of philosophy, that is, the nonempirical attempt to say what is, for those objects about which we can say nonempirically what they are: *Geist*, the state, friendship, art, religion.) Or, said in a Kantian way, *pure* concepts are constitutive of objecthood itself, not empirical classifications. In knowing this constitutive relationship, we acknowledge both the identity of conceptuality with determinate being, and the speculative nature of this identity, that is, the difference or "opposition" remaining within this identity. Any *finite* thing can be known to be what it is only by knowing it as its concept, even though as finite, it is not, never will be, fully its concept, and the full articulation of its concept is not possible. That is what it means to say it is finite. And in just this sense, knowing can genuinely be knowing, even if not being absolute knowing.⁵

So the topic is "cognition" (*Erkennen*), the status of knowing the "object-in-its-concept" itself, in both this identificatory and differentiating sense. More properly, in the appropriate philosophical register, we should say that what we want is *to understand*, not to know in the modern scientific sense, that is, to explain.⁶ When we understand something, we understand its cause, but in the Aristotelian sense, we mean we know why it is what it is, its mode of being. And this knowledge does not then ground explanation; it is self-standing. (Hegel is not leading us to: "Why does it rain?" "Because it is in the nature of rain to water the crops.")⁷ As just noted, Hegel introduces us to this final reflection by discussing the different dimensions of life as self-conscious life, or, he now says, *spirit*, a self-directed life that has itself for its object (even a plant can be said to "lead" its life, in the sense in which what it requires and

5. See 12.175: "Since the idea is the unity of the concept and reality, being has attained the significance of truth; it now is, therefore, only what the idea is. Finite things are finite because, and to the extent that, they do not possess the reality of their concept completely within them but are in need of other things for it—or, conversely, because they are presupposed as objects and consequently the concept is in them as an external determination."

6. This is a problem, I think, in Kreines (2015) and his account of Hegelian "explanation."

7. I rely here on Lear's (1988, chap. 1) discussion. See especially p. 6. See also Aristotle 1994, 1041b3–9.

what harms it are determined “by it,” by the requirements of its life-form, or “internally,” but all of this not as such, consciously), and so is both differentiated from itself and identical with itself, the structure we explored in chapter 3. Any proper subject of philosophical interrogation, like right, or art, or religion is going to be “self-directing” in this sense. Any instance must be understood as unavoidably involved in any such object’s fully realizing itself, fully becoming what it is. This, its not being fully what it is, is why it in its very being also “generates opposition” and striving. Hegel wants to pursue here, though, only the “idea of life,” that is, spirit, as he says, “*in the form that pertains to this idea as logical*” (12.197), and not in any of the other ways in which it could be considered, as soul, consciousness, spirit as such, that is, as it might be studied by the Philosophy of Subjective Spirit in the *Encyclopedia*, or even in the *Phenomenology of Spirit*. So thinking as such, self-conscious life (spirit so understood) is our subject now, in that “form that pertains to the idea as logical.” Pure thinking’s self-determination of what is necessary for any thinking to be the thinking of an object, and correspondingly, what any object must be such as to be thought, are now to be subject to one final turn of the self-consciousness screw: a reflection on the logical nature of the knowing, and, we shall find, the doing, that have made up the moments of this self-determination. Hegel then sets out what he regards as various dimensions of the specific *Erkenntnis* proper, say, to the determination of what art or religion or the state is. These include analytic and synthetic cognition, definition, division, theorem, all the moments he considers possible for “the advance of cognition *based on concept determination*” (12.221, my emphasis), *that* sort of understanding, and the relations among particularity, singularity and universality. But for us, the most interesting contribution of the life section is its bearing on a last form of concept-actuality “identity,” a new topic, practical knowing.

In doing this, we return to the most frequently stressed characteristic of thinking, self-consciousness, and its speculative logic, both self-differentiating and self-identical. (Judging is the judging of objects, of what is other than thought, and is always also consciousness of judging, but not as a separate moment. The one moment, thinking, is itself dual, but not to be understood as the duality of thinking and its objects. Acting has the same self-conscious structure. I am not acting if I am not aware of my acting, and this in no sense as a self-observation.) Hegel puts this point in the EL by saying that, even though the idea now “has itself for an object,” even though the moments in which subjective universality and objective content are “in themselves

identical,” “they are not yet *posited* as identical” (EL §223, my emphasis). The activity by which thinking seeks to posit this identity (of itself and its other) is called knowing, and its form is most familiar to us in finite knowing. Thinking’s attempt to understand itself as “the truth” of what is other than thought, being, is knowing in both its finite and its speculative moments.

Yet there is another way in which the opposition and striving for overcoming opposition characteristic of knowing manifest themselves. Thinking can either overcome any opposition of being to knowing, by *transforming itself* in the light of its “certainty” or “absolute faith in this capacity to posit the identity,” can understand itself as transforming itself internally, at the level of abstraction and with the right notion of internal necessity, to constitute what it could be to know and to be a world, or *transform the world* in order to “overcome the one-sidedness of subjectivity” (EL §225). The semblance of objectivity—that some being is the “actuality” it presents itself as—can be penetrated, understood not to be such an actuality, and transformed by “the drive of the good to bring itself about” and by “willing, the practical activity of the idea” (ibid.), another and perhaps the most obscure “two sides of the same coin” claim. (We are not much prepared for the “drive of the good to bring itself about,” except by the structural analogy with the life process: here, that, likewise, the good is actual *and* “eternally” becoming actual.) What Hegel wants to say, and where all the interesting controversy begins, is that just as in knowing, the process is “making the object one’s own,” or overcoming its alienness, by discovering the reality of reason or logos in the world, realizing itself as the world’s logos, and not by reason’s transforming itself as if in response to, or in order to mirror, an independent world, as in the empiricist picture,⁸ so in practical knowing, the subject does not face the world as an alien element that must be transformed on the basis of a *subjective demand descending wholly from pure practical reason*. Practical knowing consists both in acknowledging the “reality of the good” and in participating in the world’s own constant realization of its “purpose” by acting.

8. In the addition to EL §226, Hegel makes another interesting point about Aristotle in this respect, and it confirms much of the interpretation being presented here:

The finitude of knowing lies in the presupposition of a world already found before it, and in the process the knowing subject appears as a *tabula rasa*. This representation of things has been ascribed to Aristotle, although no one is more removed from this external way of construing knowing than Aristotle. This knowing does not yet know [*weiß*] itself as the activity of the concept, something which it is only in itself, but not for itself. Its behaviour [*Verhalten*] appears to it as something passive, yet it is in fact active.

This is the source of the most persistent and, given what he says, most understandable criticism of Hegel: that the “reconciliation” he promises, this last manifestation (here as aspiration), seems wildly idealistic and unreasonable, and that it is based on the idea of the world’s having a purpose, indeed a realized purpose, which has zero credibility today, especially after the twentieth century. This is so, even though the animus that is driving Hegel is also clear enough and not improbable. As Hegel constantly insists in various contexts, it is impossible that a practical assessment of “what ought to be” could be derived formally from practical reason alone. Material assumptions in any such attempted derivation must be and are present, are usually hidden, and reflect a specific historical context. We need to know something material about human beings to make any progress, and human beings being historical, some sort of practical knowledge is necessary to determine any rightful relation to others, a knowledge of practical reality inseparable from an assessment of what is to be done. (“The idea of the good can therefore find its completion only in the idea of the true” [12. 233].)⁹ So we should look carefully at what Hegel says, in this last attempt to convince us of the speculative identity of thought, now practical thinking about the practically real and what is to be done, with the world.

Hegel first summarizes the commonsensical view.

While what matters for intelligence is merely taking the world as it is, the will, by contrast, is bent on making the world what it ought to be. The immediate, what it finds before it, counts for the will, not as a fixed being, but instead only as a semblance [*Schein*], as something in itself vacuous.

9. It is worth emphasizing here that this commitment to a kind of materiality, or objectivism, and even perfectionism in Hegel’s ethics is quite consistent with a rejection of naturalism, even the “second nature” naturalism of McDowell. Of course, if we mean by naturalism to include a concept of “human nature” as socially self-constituting over historical time, in a way available for some sort of logos of the historical realization of the good, then a “naturalist perfectionism” in that sense could be said to characterize Hegel’s position. The account that Stern cites in the logic of the Concept leaves open, in my view, how we are to understand the source of any content that is to function normatively as what it is (“now”) to be *Geist*. This should have all been clearer in Pippin (2008, chap. 3), and in the original critique of McDowell cited there, making understandable Stern’s (2017) critique. Basically, I agree with much of Stern’s characterization of Hegel, and of a “non-biological” perfectionism, but would argue that the naturalism label remains potentially very confusing, and is not needed to counter problems raised by Wayne Martin, cited by Stern (104–5). Hegel is very insistent on the differences between a natural being’s life cycle and spirit’s. See the quotation below about the “bitter and endless struggle against itself” that characterizes spirit.

Here those contradictions come to the fore in which one stumbles around on the standpoint of morality. (EL §234A)

This contradiction is supposed to consist in the will's striving for a realization that would be the end of the will's activity if it succeeded. We can leave aside the question of why this should be a contradiction (Hegel has plenty of other things to say elsewhere about why such a conception of a pure ought applied to an alien practical actuality, the world of institutions, practices, communities and subcommunities, is incoherent.) The important issue for us is his positive account of practical knowing and its "reconciliation," the practical version of the identity of logic, or thinking, and being that we have been investigating. This is the key passage.

The reconciliation [*Versöhnung*] consists in the fact that the will, in its result, returns to the presupposition of knowing, that is to say, it consists in the unity of the theoretical and practical idea. The will knows [*weiß*] the purpose as its own and the intelligence construes the world as the actual concept. This is the true posture of rational knowing. What is vacuous and vanishing makes up only the surface, not the genuine essence of the world. This is the concept, being-in-and-for-itself, *and the world is thus itself the idea*. The unsatisfied striving disappears if we know that the final purpose of the world has been brought about and to the same degree eternally brings itself about [*daß der Endzweck der Welt ebenso vollbracht ist, als er sich ewig vollbringt*]. (EL §234A, my emphasis)

It is this last phrase, "eternally brings itself about," that returns us to what we have already seen in the nature of life and that concept's "immediate" introduction to the structure of philosophical knowledge, and that makes it impossible to ascribe to Hegel the claim that with the arrival of representative institutions, a market economy, the bourgeois family, romantic art, and Protestant Christianity, the "world's purpose" *simply* has been achieved and may now only be contemplated in full reconciliation, or even that there is an "end of history." If that were true, what would "eternally bringing it about," not just having brought it about, refer to? He goes on:

This correspondence of is and ought, meanwhile, is not a frozen and inert correspondence; for the good, the final purpose of the world, *is only in that it produces itself again and again*, and the difference between the spiritual

world and the natural world then consists in the fact that while the latter constantly only returns into itself, a *progression* also takes place in the former [*während diese nur beständig in sich selbst zurückkehrt, in jener allerdings auch ein Fortschreiten stattfindet*]. (Ibid., my emphasis)

The claim is that there is no way to understand the practical world, the social and political life created and maintained by *Geist*, except as manifesting a view of the good, and that that view calls for assessment about its relation to “the good,” the realization of human freedom. Without such attention and assessment, such a world would simply not have been understood. I note too that there would be no progression (*Fortschreiten*) if the “produces itself again and again” amounted only to repetition. That is, by explicit contrast, what life in the natural world would be.¹⁰ In the *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History* he makes this point in a more dramatic way.

This development [of the organic individual] progresses in an immediate way, without opposition and obstacle; nothing can intrude between the concept and its realization, between the nature of the germ as it is determined in itself, and its adequate existence. But in spirit, it is different. The transition from its destination [*Bestimmung*] to the realization of it is mediated through consciousness and will . . . the development, which is a tranquil emergence in nature, is a bitter and endless struggle against itself in the case of spirit. (VPG 76/77)¹¹

We note again that this struggle is “endless.”

Obviously the difficulty here is somehow putting together the claim that the final purpose of the world has both been brought about and is neverthe-

10. This means that Hegel is also not talking about what Rödl and Pinkard call “infinite ends” like health, which are not simply achieved and then the doing is finished. It is like an infinite end in always being achieved, but in the sense specific to spirit and thinking, as in the following quotation in the text. For the differences between the Aristotelian notion of end, or *telos*, and Hegel’s use of purpose or *Zweck* (a difference oddly unremarked on by Hegel), see Hogemann (1994, 83). Hogemann’s piece is an invaluable guide to the extremely truncated discussion of the idea of the good in the *Logic* (if one counts properly, Hegel devotes only two and a half pages to the topic), the history of discussions of the topic (rare and perfunctory), and the history of Hegel’s engagement with the topic.

11. Cf. Matthew 8:20. “The foxes have holes, the birds of the air have nests. But the son of man hath not where to lay his head.” The best discussion showing that Hegel’s teleological naturalism is not a biological naturalism is Pinkard (2012).

less “eternally” in the process of bringing that purpose about, a phrase that resonates with the earlier claim about eternally generating self-opposition. We can add that Hegel thinks this purpose is the objective realization of human freedom both in the objective institutions of world history and in the understanding of pure thinking as wholly self-determining and autonomous in the *SL*. But that doesn’t help much with the “eternally bringing about” phrase.

It is at least clear that Hegel is making an implicit distinction between, on the one hand, distinctly *practical reasoning*, as it is understood in Aristotle—that is, reasoning that concludes *in an action*, not in a judgment about what is to be done—and *practical knowledge* of the situation in which action is called for. (Something close to what the practically wise person, the *phronimos* as Aristotle understands her, would understand.) The assumption is that any such reasoning always relies on some knowledge of what we could call “practical actuality,” the ability to rightly distinguish between the “surface” actuality, “vacuous and vanishing,” and “the genuine essence of the world” (EL §234A). We know from our discussion of the logic of essence that this is not a strictly either/or picture; such an essence is manifest in, and has to be seen in, such a surface or *Schein*. And Hegel is insisting that any exercise of action-oriented practical rationality is inseparable from such an attempt at practical knowledge, a knowledge that will have the speculative form we have been investigating (the primary concept at issue in the case of the political is the state). In this knowing, itself the unity of the theoretical and the practical idea, or the unity of the true and the good, the will is said to know the purpose of the world as its own, and, in a restatement yet again of our theme throughout, “the intelligence knows the world as the actual concept” (ibid.). This knowledge is not of what pure practical reason requires, but of what in the state of the world requires the exercise of practical knowing, and this in a special sense beyond a mere claim for overcoming the irrationality and contingency of the existing world.

We should note too that this is not the only place where a tension like this (“has brought about” vs. “is eternally bringing about”) appears in Hegel’s thought. It is a crucial, though almost completely unnoticed, dimension of what he says about a similar topic in the preface to *The Elements of the Philosophy of Right*. The reconciliation claim, the famous or infamous “double sentence” (*Doppelsatz*), that

What is rational is actual; and what is actual is rational (PR 20)

comes with all sorts of provisos and qualifications.¹² He first notes what he regards as the common way of thinking about actuality and norms. (This is still from the preface.)

In laws of right, however, the thing [*Sache*] is not valid because it exists; on the contrary, everyone demands that it should match his own criterion. Thus a conflict may arise between what is and what ought to be, between the right which has being in and for itself, which remains unaltered, and the arbitrary determination of what is supposed to be accepted as right. A disjunction and conflict of this kind is found only in the sphere [*Boden*] of the spirit, and since the prerogative of the spirit thus seems to lead to discord and unhappiness, we often turn away from the arbitrariness of life to the contemplation of nature and are inclined to take the latter as a model. (PR 13)

But this picture, for Hegel a wholly subjective account of rationality, deteriorates into an endless debate among conflicting opinions, the “stumbling around on the standpoint of morality” and “contradiction” quoted earlier. And he proposes in contrast,

Theories are put forward in opposition to what already exists [*dem Daseienden*], theories which seek to appear correct and necessary in and for themselves. From now on, there is a more special need to recognize and comprehend the thoughts of right. Since thought has set itself up as the essential form, we must attempt to grasp right, too, in terms of thought. If thought is to take precedence over right, this would seem to throw open the door to contingent opinions; but genuine thought is not an opinion about something [*die Sache*], but the concept of the thing [*Sache*] itself. The concept of the thing does not come to us by nature. Everyone has fingers and can take a brush and paint, but that does not make him a painter. It is precisely the same with thinking. The thought of right is not, for example, what everybody knows at first hand; on the contrary, correct thinking is knowing [*das Kennen*] and recognizing the thing, and our cognition should therefore be scientific.¹³

This might look as if it leads us back to a conception of right as an abstract ideal that descends from pure practical reason and is used to measure the

12. See also Stern (2009, chap. 3) on the metaphysical, not political sense of the identification.

13. PR 14.

rightness of some institution, but we know that Hegel has already insisted that “philosophy is its own time in thought” (*ihre Zeit in Gedanken erfaßt*), that its task is to “recognize reason as the rose in the cross of the present,”¹⁴ so we know he means that contemporary institutions must be understood in something like *their* degree of realization of their concept. Otherwise and more familiarly put, criticism of the state must be an internal criticism, formulated not in the language of philosophical theory alone, but in the terms endogenous to the institution’s own self-understanding, aspiration, and purposiveness. The right exposition (*Darstellung*) of such a self-understanding is thus already a critique (*Kritik*), as we discussed in chapter 1. This is certainly what follows in the book we are to read, an account of the *modern* notion of abstract right in terms of property, individualist and responsibility-based morality, and the specific institutions of *modern* ethical life—the bourgeois, nuclear family, a modern market economy, and a representative state. None of these are compared with an abstract ideal. The attempt is to lay out their own internal logical or conceptual structure. We try to understand the concept in its actuality, and that actuality in terms of its realization of the concept. In sum, we know to do that, that this is the philosophical work needed, and what it is to do that, by virtue of knowing “the absolute idea” in the *SL*.¹⁵

Now, we return to our original puzzle—what does it mean to say that concept or the “final purpose of the world” not only has realized itself, “brought itself about” in some actuality, but is “eternally bringing itself about”? An important clue about what Hegel means is given in that passage referred to earlier here, the one much quoted but the significance of which is rarely noticed. He is explaining his claim that philosophy, philosophical science in his terms, always comes on the scene with its comprehension “too late” to do any instructing about how the world ought to be. (Why should

14. What he says about this also contributes to our topic.

To recognize reason as the rose in the cross of the present; and thereby to delight in the present—this rational insight is the reconciliation with actuality which philosophy grants to those who have received the inner call to comprehend, to preserve their subjective freedom in the realm of the substantial, and at the same time to stand with their subjective freedom not in a particular and contingent situation, but *in what has being in and for itself*. (*PR* 22)

There is no reason to think he means that any actual state has fully realized the being in and for itself of the concept state, and there are good reasons, as we shall see in a moment, to doubt that he thinks this at all.

15. The relation between what the philosopher knows, for example in a book like the *PR*, and what the ordinary citizen or even statesman “knows” is very much like that relation in Aristotle, where the practically wise person does not need to have read and understood the *Nicomachean Ethics* or the *Politics* to know what ought to be done.

this be so if a philosophy of right consists in comparing institutional actuality with an abstract concept or norm?) Rather, in what is probably, together with his remarks about history as a “slaughter bench,” in the running for the best-known quotation from Hegel,

When philosophy paints its grey in grey, a shape of life has grown old, and it cannot be rejuvenated, but only recognized, by the grey in grey of philosophy; the owl of Minerva begins its flight only with the onset of dusk.
(*PR* 23)

What is so striking about this claim is that it concludes the preface to a book that announces itself as a philosophical or “scientific” account of that shape of life *then* “actual.” The only inference one can draw is that this form of life has grown old and is dying, is turning necrotic “before our very eyes,” as it were. There is certainly no suggestion that Hegel believes that attempting to live in rightful relations to others has itself ceased to be a human need or aspiration. He must mean that *these* institutions are on their last legs, and that does seem a possible gloss on “eternally brings itself about”: that rightful institutions must produce themselves again and again. Far from blithely ignoring the sheer contingencies that human agents and societies are subject to, Hegel implies that, given these contingencies, it is likely that the state, understood as the realization of freedom, does not have anything like a permanently achieved, eternal structure, and that such historical contingencies will always pose anew the question of the rationality of the actual for any philosophy that understands itself as “its own time comprehended in thought” (where comprehended in thought means according to its concept, as that concept and the actuality it “gives itself” are understood in the *SL*).¹⁶ That question will be something like to what degree is any historical actuality “eternally bringing about the realization of the concept.” This is very much the way Hegel talks in the *EL*, in the last paragraph on practical knowledge and cognition in general.

The truth of the good is, by this means, posited as the unity of the theoretical and practical idea, [the notion] that the good has been attained in and for itself—that the objective world is thus in and for itself the idea pre-

16. As the *SL* is understood in its relation to the Philosophy of Nature and the Philosophy of Spirit; here especially the Philosophy of Objective Spirit.

cisely as it [the idea] at the same time eternally posits itself as purpose and through activity produces its actuality. This life, having come back to itself from the differentiation [*Differenz*] and finitude of knowing, and having become identical with the concept through the activity of the concept, is the speculative or absolute idea. (EL §235)

The curious phrase at issue for us is, again, “eternally posits itself as purpose and through activity produces its actuality” (*wie sie zugleich ewig als Zweck sich setzt und durch Tätigkeit ihre Wirklichkeit hervorbringt*).

This all means that it is not a refutation of Hegel’s political philosophy to point out that very little of the modern social and political world, the world of mass consumer societies, huge nation-states, deskilled industrial labor, alternate forms of marriage, globalized capitalism, the enormous power of the culture industry, and so forth looks anything like the ethical life described in the *PR*. The Hegelian argument would be that such institutions still understand themselves as rightful, *rechtlich*, and the measure of that rightfulness is still the realization of freedom, understood as Hegel does.¹⁷ (That is, any philosophical account would still have to show this, if possible, and to the degree it is possible.)¹⁸ And, on the one hand, with respect to institutions like modern marriage and the modern family, clearly a great deal of Hegel’s account of their rightfulness would have to be rethought, and various dimensions of what Hegel argued were essential elements of such social rightfulness—such as one’s job having a status worthy of respect as contribution to the common weal, that it has a “standing” (displayed in one’s role in an “estate” or *Stand*)—would still have to be understood as a requirement of right, but viewed in the light of such a requirement, much of modern labor in the contemporary world would be “false,” untrue to the essence of right.¹⁹

This all means that Hegel’s position on the historicity of reason is quite

17. Obviously a complicated and controversial claim. See Pippin 2008, chap. 9.

18. And this is all quite consistent with the claim that none of the major contemporary institutions of ethical life (*Sittlichkeit*) count as, or even a little bit as, the realization of freedom, consistent even with a claim that there has been a major regression in this regard. For an insightful view of the “traces of reason” detectable in modern social life, see Honneth 2015. See also my discussion of Honneth’s relation to Hegel in general and to the *Logic* in particular in Pippin (2015, 117–38).

19. As any brief look at YouTube videos of working conditions in an Apple factory in China, or a chicken processing plant in the United States, can make immediately clear.

complicated, and can sometimes seem like a moving target,²⁰ at times making conceptual, a priori claims about what it is to be spirit (i.e., free, in the sense of self-realizing), and at times linking any understanding of spirit to an account of concrete historical actuality. The issue is rather like how one should understand the relation between the introduction of the *PR*, which appears ahistorical and purely conceptual, and the body of the text, which plunges straightaway into modern, Western institutions. Partly this is a problem because the *PR* is an excerpted element of the *Encyclopedia's* Philosophy of Spirit, its Philosophy of Objective Spirit. In the *Encyclopedia*, this means that the section has been prepared for by a logical account of conceptuality as such, and an argument for a transition to and then from a Philosophy of Nature (which itself is everywhere informed by the historical state of the current sciences) and the entire Philosophy of Spirit. Presumably this issue of the relation between a conceptual norm and its historical realization could be settled by attending to that transition argument. For our purposes, it is important to note that one possibility Hegel is definitely excluding is any sort of Platonic or Kantian notion of a purely rationally formulated ideal, which is then used as a permanently available standard with which to judge any historical actuality. We are clearly meant to regard the introduction's explication of a free will, especially its core sections setting out the logical structure of the will, §§5, 6, and 7, as incomplete without a further explication of its historical actualization, or whatever of its historical actualization can be made out in the modern world. Section 4 is supposed to set out this relationship.

The basis of right is the realm of spirit [*das Geistige*] in general; its precise place and point of departure is the will. The will is free, so that freedom constitutes both its substance and its destiny, while the system of right is the realm of actualized freedom, the world of spirit [*Geist*] produced from within itself as a second nature.

This is completely consistent with what Hegel says about any particular state of such a historical world.

20. There is a clear elucidation of this conception of a practical end in Pinkard (2012): "The actually free person is thus like Aristotle's person of virtue. Both operate in terms of a comprehensive conception of the good. For Aristotle it is like a target at which we aim, whereas for Hegel, the target is always in motion by virtue of our aiming at it. The target is a conception of the good that is concretely changing in light of our employment of the concept itself" (93). Pinkard's discussion throughout chapter 3 is among the most valuable on this topic.

The good thus remains an ought; it exists in and for itself, but being, as the ultimate abstract immediacy, remains over against it also determined as a non-being. The idea of the fulfilled good is indeed an absolute postulate, but no more than a postulate, that is, the absolute encumbered with the determinateness of subjectivity. There still are two worlds in opposition, one a realm of subjectivity in the pure spaces of transparent thought, the other a realm of objectivity in the element of an externally manifold actuality, an impervious realm of darkness [*Reich der Finsterniß*]. (12.233)²¹

That last phrase hardly sounds like an uncritical affirmation of whatever has come about.

There are, finally, further indications of how this relationship between logic and history should be understood in the way Hegel characterizes his concluding moment, the absolute idea.

The Absolute Idea

Here is the way the EL formulates the last topic of the *Logic*.

The absolute idea is first the unity of the theoretical and the practical idea and, by this means, at the same time the unity of the idea of life and the idea of knowing. In knowing [*Erkennen*], we had the idea in the form of difference [*Differenz*] and the process of knowing has presented itself to us as the overturning of this difference and as the restoration of that unity which, as such and in its immediacy, is first the idea of life. The deficiency of [the concept of] life consists in being at first only the idea insofar as it is in itself [*die an sich seiende Idee*]; in contrast to this, but in just as one-sided a fash-

21. This phrase appears to be a reference to Plotinus. See Hogemann 1994, 97–98. Hogemann doubts, though, with good reason, that the historical references in Hegel's discussion of the good (Plato, Plotinus, Kant) can be successfully distinguished, although the fact that it occurs in the subjective and not objective logic is no doubt significant. It is also the case that the reference is puzzling when one compares it with the striking image of the realm of pure thinking from which I have taken my title, the realm of shadows. That realm is referred to here as "the pure spaces of transparent thought." Working this out depends on how seriously one takes Hegel's imagery. (Or how seriously one takes Hegel's seriousness in using it.) If the realm of "thinking thinking thinking" is a realm of shadows, what is casting the shadows? What is the light? Why the apparent reference to what Plato's prisoners see on the walls of the cave? If *Denkbestimmungen* are shadows, they can only be shadows of themselves, or thought's self-reflection. In that case what does it mean that these reflections are "shadows"? Such questions multiply as soon as one proffers an interpretation.

ion, knowing is only the idea insofar as it is for itself. The unity and truth of these two is the idea insofar as it is in and for itself and, thereby, absolute. Up to now we have had for our object [*Gegenstand*] the idea in the development through its diverse stages; now, however, the idea is objective with respect to itself [*sich selbst gegenständlich*]. This is the *noēsis noēseōs*; what Aristotle already designated as the highest form of the idea. (EL §236A)

Even for Hegel, this is quite a mouthful. The absolute idea, or “the logical idea,” is also called, revealingly for our interests, “*the idea of thinking itself*.” That is, thinking’s self-determination of its necessary moments has reached full self-consciousness: *noēsis noēseōs*. (That the only determination of pure thinking can be by pure thinking, or a self-determination, helps to explain why “life” is the immediate form of the idea. A life-form’s life cycle is determined by the kind of being it is, a kind of immediate self-determination. It lives “for itself,” for what it needs, avoiding what is harmful, etc. The end of its living is its life-form, its concept.)²² Pure thinking, in determining what could be the object of a true self-conscious judgment, has turned to itself as the object of speculative judgment, since it has discovered, in detail, that the “truth” of objects is the relevant pure “concept,” that conceptual determination without which no empirical determination would be possible, that is: qualitative and quantitative predication, a determination based on an essence-appearance distinction, the right understanding of substance, causality, and now the right understanding of the “thoughts” that have made up the account thus far. Pure thinking is now in a position to “recollect” what it “was” to have been thinking purely. (We don’t thereby know any qualities or essences or attributes of modes of substance. We know the logic of substance-attribute, essence-appearance, and so forth. This will create a feeling of deflation at the end of the work that Hegel will address and that we will discuss below.) Of course, in one sense, knowing what we are about in pure thinking is what we should have understood at the beginning, not at the end. But an end that is a beginning, but that is fully comprehended as a beginning only at the end, and is essentially a recollection of its prior moments,²³ is very much how Hegel talks in this section.

22. For an exhaustive and compelling treatment of this theme in German Idealism, see Khurana 2017. The idea that being free consists in acting according to the law of one’s own essence also plays a crucial role in Schelling.

23. This end/beginning relation is stressed several times, and explained persuasively, in Kreines 2015. See also Nuzzo (2005, 200ff).

The final [point] is the insight that the entire unfolding makes up the content and interest. — This is, furthermore, the philosophical view that everything that appears limited [*Beschränktes*], taken for itself, acquires its worth [*Wert*] through inhering in the whole and being a moment of the idea. Thus it is that we have had the content and what we still have is the knowledge [*Wissen*] that the content is the living development of the idea and this simple retrospective [*Rückblick*] is contained in the form. Each of the stages considered up to this point is an image of the absolute, albeit in a limited manner at first, and so it drives itself on to the whole, the unfolding of which is precisely what we have designated the method. (EL §238A)

We have some sense now of the various aspects of the unity of the idea now on view: the unity of the subjective and the objective idea (logic as metaphysics), the unity of the theoretical and the practical idea (willing is a form of thinking; thinking is what Hegel calls in this section a “synthesis of striving” or inseparable from willing),²⁴ the unity of the idea of life and the idea of knowing (the immediate unity of a life-form with itself, and the self-differentiation, the lack, that requires theoretical and practical knowing), and the unity of the analytic and the synthetic method (which I have treated as logically equivalent to the discussions of reflective and determinative judgment in chapter 6 and chapter 8). But this last characterization of *method* as the culmination of the entire book, as the absolute idea, is crucial.

In the *SL*, when he is trying to differentiate the *Logic* up until the introduction of the absolute idea, he distinguishes in effect between pure thinking determining itself in regard to anything it might judge about, and this new thought, what it is to have pure thinking itself as such an object. In the *EL*, in a rather informal anticipation of what he senses might be his reader’s frustration with the abstractness and nonsubstantive character of such an absolute, he notes, “When one speaks of the absolute idea, one can think that here finally the substantive must come to the fore, that here everything must become clear [*hier müsse sich alles ergeben*]” (EL §237A). He is anticipating

24. “Each is therefore a synthesis of striving, each possessing as well as not possessing the idea within it, passing over from one thought to the other without bringing the two together but remaining fixed in the contradiction of the two. The absolute idea, as the rational concept that in its reality only rejoins itself, is by virtue of this immediacy of its objective identity, on the one hand, a turning back to life; on the other hand, it has equally sublated this form of its immediacy and harbors the most extreme opposition within” (12.236).

those Hegel interpreters who want Hegel to defend a substantive absolute, God, a necessary being, a substance that is also subject, and so forth, and he is taking steps here to close off explicitly such an interpretation. In the *SL*, he characterizes the absolute idea in a way that returns us to his “realm of shadows” characterization. The absolute idea, he notes,

has shown itself to amount to this, namely that determinateness does not have the shape of a content, but that it is simply as form, and that accordingly the idea is the absolutely universal idea. What is left to be considered here, therefore, is thus not a content as such, but the universal character of its form—that is, method. (12.237)

Appropriately, the truth is the truth being demonstrated throughout the book, recollected here as such, the identity of the forms of thought and the forms of being, now thought as such, and not any determination of content (any determination of *which* quality, what essence, what cause, etc.).²⁵

This result could easily be misinterpreted. The absolute idea—expressed in our terms, the identity of logic and metaphysics—could be understood as some sort of direct *inference* from the logical structure of thought. The basic form of rendering intelligible, one might reason, is the one-place categorical judgment, *S* is *P*. This simply requires, if to be is to be intelligible, that the world be structured as substances and properties. QED. But that would be dogmatism, and would be rejected by Hegel. The characteristic and necessary features of judgment must be derived with a claim to necessity from the simplest, most immediate manifestation of contentful thought, “Being!” It is always possible to suspect that in any such derivation, we are specifying only “what we must think” or even “must believe,” in order to judge rightly that something is the case. But such a suspicion is arbitrary if there is no reason to suspect such parochialism, as if thinking were obviously a species characteristic. The radicality of Hegel’s presuppositionless beginning is supposed to eliminate such a suspicion from the outset, and the self-negating

25. In this sense, Nuzzo (2005) is quite right that “Hegel replaces the metaphysical Absolute with a theory of absolute cognition, whereby knowledge of the absolute turns into absolute knowing . . . The term absolute for Hegel is no longer substantive but only adjective . . . absolute knowing, absolute idea, absolute spirit” (188). Likewise with her claim that by the absolute idea, Hegel simply means the logic itself (191). As argued in chapter 7 here, I have a stronger notion of Hegel’s language of logical striving (*Streben*) or impulse (*Trieb*) than Nuzzo.

and self-correcting derivation is supposed to preserve such purity. He realizes that the avoidance of any such parochialism, the establishment of pure thinking just as such as the “truth” of being, will disappoint anyone used to a more substantive version of metaphysics. Hence his somewhat ironic “sorry to disappoint you” anticipation cited earlier. That truth, though, the absolute idea, just *is* self-conscious conceptuality, or the right understanding of the implications of the logical structure of apperception, or purely logical knowledge, and in this purity the manifestation of absolute freedom. Once this has been established, the bearing of this system on determinate “what is . . . ?” questions that are nonempirical can be shown.

We are very far here from a Hegel committed to deriving the content of the world from pure thought alone, or who believes he has determined once and for all “the purpose of the world.” But, however “shadowy,” Hegel’s *Logic* is hardly a thin formalism. It—the idea of thought’s pure self-determination, the right understanding of thinking generally—stands against many other “absolute ideas” (whether characterized that way or not) that are prominent in modern philosophy: empiricism, dogmatic rationalism, reductionism, scientism, consequentialism, moralism. And the implications of the account of pure thinking, of philosophy itself, once those implications are drawn out in the rest of the *Encyclopedia*, are of great importance in philosophy for how we should understand the conceptual structure of any investigation of nature, and how human freedom should be understood, what counts as its realization. He only gestures at this extension in the closing moments of the EL and the SL, but what he says is significant.

“Transition”

The least ambitious way to characterize how Hegel wants us to understand the relationship between the *Logic* and the Philosophies of Nature and of Spirit is that the conceptual structure of either interrogation cannot be coherently understood as wholly empirically determined. Each depends in some way on a nonderived conceptual structure manifested in its pure form in the SL. This is not incorrect, but it does not yet distinguish how Hegel thinks of that relationship in a way that will exclude the commonsense notion of an empty, subjective pure form being filled in by objective experience. This notion cannot be right because on Hegel’s approach any such conceptual structure already determines the concrete possibility of determinately in-

telligible empirical content.²⁶ (It does not determine the content itself,²⁷ but the inseparable form of such content, a logical form now understood as inflected by attention to what is other than pure thought and to action in the world.) Said more precisely to avoid any hint of “impositionism” (what critics usually mean when they understand an interpretation like this one to be a species of “transcendental” philosophy), the formal determinateness of any such content is *identical* with conceptual determinacy. But that concerns pure concepts. As we have already seen, there is plenty of room for the exploration of an unknown empirical and finite world, that “realm of darkness.”²⁸

But it is precisely the right understanding of the absolute idea as method that can be said to open the door to the “philosophy of reality,” the *Realphilosophie*, that depends on such an understanding of conceptuality. The point made above, that this philosophical appeal to a structure of knowing as bearing on the extralogical is not a form of impositionism or “transcendentalism,” is made by Hegel in the penultimate paragraph of the EL.

The method is not an external form but the soul and concept of the content, from which it is distinguished only insofar as the moments of the concept, even in themselves, in their [respective] determinacy, come to appear as the totality of the concept. (EL §243)

But his actual specification of the transition to the Philosophy of Nature is difficult to understand. He writes:

Yet the absolute freedom of the idea is that it does not merely pass over into life or let life shine in itself as finite knowing, but instead, in the absolute truth of itself, resolves to release freely from itself the moment of its particularity or the first determining and otherness, the immediate idea, as its reflection itself as nature [*sondern in der absoluten Wahrheit ihrer selbst sich entschließt, das Moment ihrer Besonderheit oder des ersten Bestimmens und*

26. See Dahlstrom's (2008, 113) apt remarks about “content” (and his general defense of what he calls “metaphysical truth” in the *SL*).

27. See the clear denial of any such project of deducibility in PN §250.

28. The contemporary discussion of conceptual versus nonconceptual content often centers on perception, and these formulations are clearly too abstract to be of use in this form for working out the details of perceptual awareness. Doing so under Hegelian assumptions, attentive to what he says in the *PhG* and in his philosophical psychology, is a task in itself. For an indication, see Pippin 2013c.

Andersseins, die unmittelbare Idee als ihren Widerschein, sich als Natur frei aus sich zu entlassen]. (EL §244)

The idea itself as nature, and nature as the reflection or *Widerschein* of the idea, is obviously what poses the difficulty for any commentator. This makes the point that in any investigation of nature or spirit there must be an a priori element reflecting the basic structure or moments of the logic of being and the logic of essence, but inflected in a way that reflects the domains of nature and spirit. Of course, we cannot understand this very well without studying what this looks like in the two other parts of the *Encyclopedia*, but the phrase “resolves to release freely from itself” suggests a practical dimension underlying the *Logic*’s movement that we discussed in chapter 7 and that surfaces here as a result of the *Logic*’s own self-consciousness about its proper subject matter, an incompleteness captured so mysteriously in our title, the realm of shadows. In the *SL*, this is more explicit and even dramatic.

this idea is still logical; it is shut up in pure thought [*in den reinen Gedanken eingeschlossen*], the science only of the divine concept. Its systematic exposition is of course itself a realization, but one confined within the same sphere. Because the pure idea of cognition is to this extent shut up within subjectivity, it is the impulse [*Trieb*] to sublimate it, and pure truth becomes as final result also the beginning of another sphere and science. (12.253)

In qualifying this expansion, we might call it, of the bearing of the logical on the extralogical (Hegel cautions us that it should not be understood as a “transition” in the sense we have become used to within the *Logic*),²⁹ he again says that the idea “freely discharges” or releases (*entläßt*) itself (12.253). He means that the logician can understand this bearing without any qualification on the self-sufficiency and philosophical priority of the absolute idea, even with respect to the “externality of space and time absolutely existing for itself without subjectivity” (12.253). This self-sufficiency and priority are not qualified by such a “release.” Nothing will qualify the logical fact that everything intelligible “remains in and for itself the totality of the concept” (*ibid.*). And he ends the book without much detail about the nature of this dissatisfaction with the self-enclosed concept, but with a firm, and I hope by

29. Cf. Pinkard’s (2012, 36) brief but lucid explanation why the relation is not really a “transition.”

now relatively clear, restatement of the nature of a speculative logic, and a reference to the final completion of the *Encyclopedia* in the Philosophy of Spirit.

But what is posited by this first resolve of the pure idea to determine itself as external idea is only the mediation out of which the concept, as free concrete existence that from externality has come to itself, raises itself up, completes this self-liberation in the science of spirit, and in the science of logic finds the highest concept of itself, the pure concept conceptually comprehending itself [*dem sich begreifenden reinen Begriffe*]. (12.253)³⁰

30. Cf. Aristotle 1994a, 1047b34: "Since it is indeed the best thing, [divine *nous*] must understand itself, and its understanding is an understanding of understanding" (*hauton ara noeī, eiper esti to kratiston, kai estin hē noēsis noēseōs noēsis*).

REFERENCE LIST

Hegel Texts and Abbreviations

Hegel's works are cited, in so far as it is possible, from the edition of his *Gesammelte Werke* (GW), ed. Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Hamburg: Meiner, 1968–). For the *Science of Logic* (SL), the volume number and page are cited. The Cambridge translation of the *Logic*, by George di Giovanni (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), has helpfully listed the volume and page number of the GW in the margins, and his translation is the one used, although I have often altered it in cases of disagreement.

For the Encyclopedia Logic (EL) and the Philosophy of Nature (PN) and Philosophy of Spirit (PS), I have used the volumes in the *Werke* (W), ed. E. Moldenhauer and K. Michel (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1970–71), vols. 8, 9, and 10. Passages are cited by paragraph number. The translation used is *The Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences in Basic Outline*, part 1: *Science of Logic*, trans. K. Brinkmann and D. Dahlstrom (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), and I have also consulted *The Encyclopedia Logic*, trans. T. F. Geraets, W. A. Suchting, and H. S. Harris (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1991), although for both translations I have occasionally made changes. Likewise for references to the lectures on fine art (VA) in volumes 13, 14, and 15 of W.

For the *Phenomenology of Spirit* (PhG), references are to *Die Phänomenologie des Geistes, Hauptwerke in sechs Bänden*, vol. 2 (Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1992) (this is the more compact edition of GW; page numbers are the same in both editions); the translation used is the forthcoming translation by Terry Pinkard at Cambridge University Press.

References to Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* (CPR) and other works are to the English translations listed below. The German text is *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaftlichen (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1922). *Kritik der Urteilstkraft* (KU) is volume 20 of this edition.

Further abbreviations for Hegel's texts are listed here.

- A:** *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*. Trans. T. M. Knox. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- BPhG:** *The Berlin Phenomenology*. Ed. and trans. M. J. Petry. Berlin: Springer, 1981.
- DS:** *Differenz des Fichte'schen und Schelling'schen Systems der Philosophie*. GW 4: 1–92. Translation used: *The Difference between Fichte's and Schelling's System of Philosophy*, trans. H. Harris and W. Cerf (Albany: SUNY Press, 1977).
- JA:** *Sämtliche Werke*. Jubiläumsausgabe in zwanzig Bände. Stuttgart: Frommanns, 1959.
- L:** *Hegel: The Letters*. Trans. C. Butler and C. Seiler. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- LHP:** *Lectures on the History of Philosophy in Three Volumes*. Trans. S. Haldane and F. Simson. London: Kegan Paul, 1896. *W*, vols. 18, 19, 20.
- NL:** *The Scientific Way of Treating Natural Law*. Trans. T. M. Knox. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1975.
- PR:** *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts*. In *W*, vol. 7. Translation used: *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*, ed. A. Wood, trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- VGP:** *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie*. In *W*, vols. 18, 19, 20.
- VL:** *Vorlesungen über Logik und Metaphysik. Ausgewählte Nachschriften und Manuskripte*. GW, vol. 11.
- VP:** *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte*. In *W*, vol. 12.

Other Literature

- Angelelli, I. 1967. *Studies on Gottlob Frege and Traditional Philosophy*. New York: Humanities Press.
- Aristotle. 1984. *Physics: Books I and II*. Trans. W. Charlton. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1994a. *Metaphysics: Books Z and H*. Trans. David Bostock. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1994b. *Posterior Analytics*. Trans. J. Barnes. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1995. *On the Soul*. Trans. W. S. Hett. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Biard, J., D. Buvat, J.-F. Kervegan, J. F. Kling, A. Lacroix, A. Lecrivain, and M. Slubicki. 1981. *Introduction à la lecture de la science de la logique de Hegel*. Paris: Aubier-Montaigne.
- Blecher, I. 2013. "Kant on Formal Modality." *Kant-Studien* 104, no. 1.
- Bole, T. 1974. "The Dialectic of Hegel's Logic as the Logic of Ontology." *Hegel-Jahrbuch* 14.
- Bowman, B. 2013. *Hegel and the Metaphysics of Absolute Negativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2017. "Self-Determination and Ideality in Hegel's Logic of Being." In Moyar 2017, 219–41.
- Boyle, M. 2016. "Additive Theories of Rationality: A Critique." *European Journal of Philosophy* 24, no. 3: 527–55.
- Brandom, R. 1986. "Frege's Technical Concepts: Some Recent Developments." In L. Haaparanta and J. Hintikka, eds., *Frege Synthesized*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel. 253–95.
- . 1994. *Making It Explicit*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . 2000a. *Articulating Reasons*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . 2000b. "Vocabularies of Pragmatism: Synthesizing Naturalism and Historicism." In *Rorty and His Critics*, ed. Brandom. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000.

- . 2002. *Tales of the Mighty Dead*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . 2005. "Sketch of a Program for a Critical Reading of Hegel. Comparing Empirical and Logical Concepts." *Internationales Jahrbuch des Deutschen Idealismus* 3: 131–61.
- . 2011. "Knowing and Representing. Reading (Between the Lines) Hegel's Introduction." Munich lectures I, II and III. <http://www.pitt.edu/~brandom/multimedia.html>.
- . 2012. "Hegel and Analytic Philosophy." <http://www.pitt.edu/~brandom/currentwork.html>.
- . 2014. *A Spirit of Trust: A Semantic Reading of Hegel's Phenomenology*. http://www.pitt.edu/~brandom/spirit_of_trust_2014.html.
- Brinkmann, K. 2011. *Idealism without Limits: Hegel on the Problem of Objectivity*. New York: Springer.
- Bubner, R. 1976. "Strukturprobleme dialektischer Logik." In U. Guzzoni, B. Rang, and L. Siep, *Idealismus und seine Gegenwart*. Hamburg: Felix Meiner. 36–52.
- . 2003. "Hegel's Science of Logic: The Completion or Sublation of Metaphysics." In Bubner, *Innovations of Idealism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 60–83.
- Burbidge, J. 2004. "Hegel's Logic." In *Handbook of the History of Logic*, ed. D. M. Gabbay and J. Woods. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 131–75.
- Carlson, D. G., ed. 2005. *Hegel's Theory of the Subject*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cobben, P., P. Cruysberghs, P. Jonkers, and L. De Vos. 2006. *Hegel-Lexikon*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Conant, J. 1991. "The Search for Logically Alien Thought: Descartes, Kant, Frege, and the *Tractatus*." *Philosophical Topics* 20, no. 1: 115–80.
- Dahlstrom, D. 2008. "Hegel's Science of Logic and Idea of Truth." In *Philosophical Legacies: Essays on the Thought of Kant, Hegel, and Their Contemporaries*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.
- DeLaurentis, A., and J. Edwards. 2013. *The Bloomsbury Companion to Hegel*. London: Bloomsbury.
- deVries, W. 1991. "The Dialectic of Teleology." *Philosophical Topics* 19: 51–70.
- . 1993. "Hegel's Logic and Philosophy of Mind." In *The Age of German Idealism*, ed. R. Solomon and K. Higgins. New York: Routledge.
- Di Giovanni, G. 2010. Introduction. In *SL* xi–lxxiv.
- Dodd, J. 2000. *An Identity Theory of Truth*. London: Macmillan.
- Dummett, M. 1973. *Frege: Philosophy of Language* (London: Duckworth)
- Düsing, K. 1986. "Die Idee des Lebens in Hegels Logik." In *Hegels Philosophie der Natur*, ed. R.-P. Horstmann and M. Petry. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- . 2011. "Ontology and Dialectic in Hegel's Thought." In *The Dimensions of Hegel's Dialectic*, ed. N. Limnatis. London: Continuum. 97–121.
- Emundts, D., and S. Sedgwick, eds. 2014. *International Yearbook of German Idealism: "Logic."* Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Evans, G. 1985. *Collected Papers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Falk, H.-P. 1983. *Das Wissen in Hegels Wissenschaft der Logik*. Munich: Karl Alber.
- Ferrarin, A. 2007. *Hegel and Aristotle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frank, M. 2002. *Selbstgefühl*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

- . 2007. *Auswege aus dem Deutschen Idealismus*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Franks, P. 2005. *All or Nothing: Systematicity, Transcendental Arguments and Skepticism in German Idealism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Frege, G. 1980. *The Foundations of Arithmetic: A Logico-Mathematical Inquiry into the Concept of Numbers*. Trans. J. L. Austin. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 1984. *Collected Papers on Mathematics, Logic, and Philosophy*. Ed. B. McGuinness. London: Blackwell.
- . 1986. *Die Grundlagen der Arithmetik*. Hamburg: Meiner.
- . 1997a. *The Frege Reader*. Ed. M. Beaney. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 1997b. "The Thought: A Logical Inquiry." In *Readings in the Philosophy of Language*, ed. P. Ludlow. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Frey, C. 2007. "Organic Unity and the Matter of Man." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 32: 167–204.
- Fricke, C., P. König, and T. Petersen, eds. 1995. *Das Recht der Vernunft: Kant und Hegel über Denken, Erkennen, und Handeln*. Stuttgart-Bad Canstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.
- Fulda, H. F. 1978. "Unzulängliche Bemerkungen zur Dialektik." In Horstmann 1978, 33–69.
- . 1991. "Philosophisches Denken in einer spekulativen Metaphysik." In *Hegels Transformation der Metaphysik*, ed. D. Pätzold and A. J. Vanderjagt. Cologne: Dinter.
- Ginsborg, H. 1997. "Aesthetic and Biological Purposiveness." In *Reclaiming the History of Ethics: Essays for John Rawls*, ed. A. Reath and B. Herman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 329–60.
- . 2001. "Kant on Understanding Organisms as Natural Purposes." In *Kant and the Sciences*, ed. Eric Watkins. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 63–78.
- . 2004. "Two Kinds of Mechanical Inexplicability in Kant and Aristotle." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 42: 33–65.
- Greenberg, C. 1971. "Cézanne." In *Art and Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hacking, I. 1979. "What Is Logic?" *Journal of Philosophy* 76, no. 6: 285–319.
- Hanna, R. 1986. "From an Ontological Point of View: Hegel's Critique of the Common Logic." *Review of Metaphysics* 40: 305–38.
- Harris, H. S. 1972. *Hegel's Development: Toward the Sunlight, 1770–1801*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1983. *Hegel's Development: Night Thoughts, 1801–1806*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hartmann, K. 1976. "Hegel: A Non-Metaphysical View." In MacIntyre 1976, 101–24.
- . 1999. *Hegels Logik*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Heis, J. 2012. "Attempts to Rethink Logic." In Wood and Hahn 2012, 95–132.
- Henrich, D. 1966. "Fichtes ursprüngliche Einsicht." In *Subjektivität und Metaphysik*, ed. D. Henrich and H. Wagner. Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1966. 188–232.
- . 1971. "Anfang und Methode der Logik." *Hegel im Kontext*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp. 73–94.
- . 1976. "Hegels Grundoperation. Eine Einleitung in die 'Wissenschaft der Logik.'" In *Der Idealismus und seine Gegenwart*, ed. U. Guzzoni, B. Rang, and L. Siep. Hamburg: Felix Meiner. 208–30.

- . 1978. "Formen der Negation in Hegels Logik." In Horstmann 1978, 213–29.
- . 1982. "Selbstbewußtsein und spekulatives Denken." *Fluchtlinien. Philosophische Essays*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp. 125–81.
- , ed. 1986. *Probleme der Hegelschen Logik*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- . 1992. *Der Grund im Bewußtsein. Untersuchungen zu Hölderlins Denken (1794/95)*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- . 1997. *The Course of Remembrance and Other Essays on Hölderlin*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hogemann, F. 1994. "Die 'Idee des Guten' in Hegels Wissenschaft der Logik." *Hegel-Studien* 29.
- Honneth, A. 2015. *Freedom's Right: The Social Foundations of Democratic Life*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hornsby, J. 1997. "Truth: The Identity Theory." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 97: 1–24.
- Horstmann, R.-P. 1972. "Problem der Wandlung in Hegels Jenaer Systemkonzeptionen." *Philosophische Rundschau* 19: 87–118.
- . 1977. "Jenaer Systemkonzeption." In Pöggeler 1977, 43–58.
- , ed. 1978. *Seminar: Dialektik in der Philosophie Hegels*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- . 1984. *Ontologie und Relationen: Hegel, Bradley, Russell, und die Kontroverse über interne und externe Beziehungen*. Königstein: Athenäum.
- . 2006. "Substance, Subject, and Infinity: A Case Study of the Role of Logic in Hegel's System." In *Hegel: New Directions*, ed. K. Deligiorgi. Durham, NC: Acumen. 69–84.
- . 2017. "Hegel on Objects as Subjects." In Moyar 2017, 121–38.
- Houlgate, S. 2006. *The Opening of Hegel's Logic: From Being to Infinity*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.
- Hyppolite, J. 1997. *Logic and Existence*. Trans. L. Lawlor and A. Sen. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Jaeschke, W. 2010. *Hegel Handbuch: Leben, Werke, Schule*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.
- Kant, I. 1992. "Essay on the Mistaken Subtlety of the Four Figures." In *Kant's Introduction to Logic and His Essay on the Mistaken Subtlety of the Four Figures*, ed. T. Kingsmill. Bristol, UK: Thoemmes Press.
- . 1993. *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Trans. J. Ellington. Indianapolis: Hackett.
- . 1997. *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*. Trans. G. Hatfield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1999a. *Correspondence*. Trans. and ed. A. Zweig. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1999b. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. P. Guyer and A. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2000. *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. Trans. P. Guyer and E. Matthews. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2004. *Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science*. Trans. M. Friedman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2010. *Theoretical Philosophy after 1781*. Ed. H. Allison. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kern, W. 1971. "Die Aristotelsdeutung Hegels." *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 78: 237–59.
- Khurana, T. 2017. *Das Leben der Freiheit. Form und Wirklichkeit der Autonomie*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.
- Kimhi, I. 2018. *Thinking and Being*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Klostermann, V., ed. 1970. *Durchblicke: Martin Heidegger zum 80. Geburtstag*. Frankfurt: Klostermann.
- Kneale, W., and M. Kneale. 1962. *The Development of Logic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Koch, Anton. 2014. *Die Evolution des logischen Raumes. Aufsätze zu Hegels Nichtstandard-Metaphysik*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck.
- Koch, Anton, Alexander Oberauer, and Konrad Utz, eds. 2003. *Der Begriff als die Wahrheit. Zum Anspruch der hegelschen 'Subjektiven Logik.'* Paderborn: Schöningh.
- Koch, Anton, and Friedrike Schick, eds. 2002. *G. W. F. Hegel. Wissenschaft der Logik*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Koch, Anton, Friedrike Schick, Klaus Vieweg, and Claudia Wirsing, eds. 2014. *Hegel—200 Jahre Wissenschaft der Logik*. Hamburg: Felix Meiner.
- Kok, A. 2013. *Kant, Hegel, und die Frage der Metaphysik. Über die Möglichkeit der Philosophie nach der kopernikanischen Wende*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink.
- Kosman, A. 1994. "Activity of Being in Aristotle's Metaphysics." In *Unity, Identity, and Explanation in Aristotle's Metaphysics*, ed. T. Scaltsas, D. Charles, and M. Louise Gill. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2013. *The Activity of Being: An Essay on Aristotle's Ontology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kreines, J. 2008. "The Logic of Life: Hegel's Philosophical Defense of Natural Teleology." In *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel*, ed. F. Beiser. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2015. *Reason in the World: Hegel's Metaphysics and Its Philosophical Appeal*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2017. "From Objectivity to Absolute Idea in Hegel's *Logic*." In Moya 2017, 310–62.
- Künne, W. 2003. *Conceptions of Truth*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lachterman, D. 1987. "Hegel and the Formalization of Logic." *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal* 1, no. 2: 153–236.
- Larmore, Charles. 2017. *Das Selbst in seinem Verhältnis zu sich und zu anderen*. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann.
- Lear, J. 1988. *Aristotle: The Desire to Understand*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leibniz, G. W. 1989. *Philosophical Essays*. Trans. Roger Ariew and Daniel Garber. Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Longuenesse, B. 1998. *Kant and the Capacity to Judge*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2006. "Kant on A Priori Concepts and the Metaphysical Deduction of the Categories." In *The Cambridge Companion to Kant and Modern Philosophy*, ed. Paul Guyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 129–68.
- . 2007. *Hegel's Critique of Metaphysics*. Trans. N. Simek Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ludlow, P. 1997. *Readings in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

- MacIntyre, A. 1976. *Hegel: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.
- Martin, C. 2012. *Ontologie der Selbstbestimmung. Eine operationale Rekonstruktion von Hegels Wissenschaft der Logik*. Tübingen: Mohr Sibeck.
- Marx, K. 1962. *Frühe Schriften*. Vol. 1. Ed. H.-J. Lieber and Peter Furth. Stuttgart: Cotta.
- McDowell, J. 1996. *Mind and World*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . 1998. *Mind, Value, and Reality*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . 2007. "On Pippin's Postscript." *European Journal of Philosophy* 135: 3.
- . 2009. *Having the World in View: Essays on Kant, Hegel, and Sellars*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- McFarlane, J. 2001. "Frege, Kant and the Logic of Logicism." *Philosophical Review* 111, no. 1: 25–65.
- Moore, A. N. 2012. *The Evolution of Modern Metaphysics: Making Sense of Things*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moyar, D., ed. 2017. *The Oxford Handbook of Hegel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mure, R. G. R. 1940. *An Introduction to Hegel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1950. *A Study of Hegel's Logic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nuzzo, A. 2005. "The End of Hegel's Logic: Absolute Idea as Absolute Method." In Carlson 2005, 187–205.
- Patzig, G. 1974. "Widerspruch." In *Handbuch der philosophischen Grundbegriffe*, ed. H. Krings, H. M. Baumgartner, and Ch. Wild. Munich: Kösel.
- Pinkard, T. 1988. *Hegel's Dialectic: The Explanation of Possibility*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- . 2012. *Hegel's Naturalism: Mind, Nature, and the Final Ends of Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pippin, R. 1982. *Kant's Theory of Form: An Essay on The Critique of Pure Reason*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- . 1986. Review of Henry E. Allison, *Kant's Transcendental Idealism*. *Kant-Studien* 77, no. 3.
- . 1989. *Hegel's Idealism: The Satisfactions of Self-Consciousness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1999. *Modernism as a Philosophical Problem: On the Dissatisfactions of European High Culture*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 2000. "Fichte's Alleged One-Sided, Subjective, Psychological Idealism." In *The Reception of Kant's Critical Philosophy: Fichte, Schelling and Hegel*, ed. Sally Sedgwick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 147–70.
- . 2002. "Leaving Nature Behind: Or, Two Cheers for Subjectivism." In *Reading McDowell: Essays on Mind and World*, ed. N. Smith. New York: Routledge.
- . 2003. "Hegels Begriffslogik als die Logik der Freiheit." In Koch et al. 2003, 223–37.
- . 2005. "Concept and Intuition: On Distinguishability and Separability." *Hegel-Studien* 40: 25–39.
- . 2006. "Brandom's Hegel." *European Journal of Philosophy* 13, no. 3: 381–408.
- . 2007. "McDowell's Germans: Response to 'On Pippin's Postscript.'" *European Journal of Philosophy* 15, no. 3: 411–34.

- . 2008. *Hegel's Practical Philosophy: Rational Agency as Ethical Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2010. *Hegel on Self-Consciousness: Desire and Death in the Phenomenology of Spirit*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2013a. *After the Beautiful: Hegel and the Philosophy of Pictorial Modernism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2013b. "Back to Hegel: Slavoj Žižek, *Less Than Nothing: Hegel and the Shadow of Dialectical Materialism*." *Mediations* 26, nos. 1 and 2: 7–28.
- . 2013c. "What Is Conceptual Activity?" In *Mind, Reason, and Being-in-the-World: The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate*, ed. Joseph Schear. London: Routledge.
- . 2015. *Interanimations: Receiving Modern German Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2016. "Hegel über die politische Bedeutung kollektiven Selbstbetrugs." In *Gechichte, Gesellschaft, Geltung*, ed. M. Quante. Hamburg: Felix Meiner.
- . 2017. *The Philosophical Hitchcock: Vertigo and the Anxieties of Unknowingness*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pöggeler, O. 1977. *Hegel: Einführung in seine Philosophie*. Freiburg: Alber.
- Redding, P. 2007. *Analytic Philosophy and the Return of Hegelian Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2012. Replies to Bob Brandom and Jim Kreines. Private correspondence.
- Rödl, S. 2006. "Logical Form as a Relation to the Object." *Philosophical Topics* 34, nos. 1 and 2: 335–69.
- . 2007. *Self-Consciousness*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . 2008. "Eliminating Externality." *International Yearbook of German Idealism*. Vol. 5. Berlin: de Gruyter. 1–14.
- . Forthcoming a. "Hegel's Dialectic and Aristotle's Stufenleiter of Life."
- . Forthcoming b. "The *Science of Logic* as the Self-Constitution of Life."
- Rohs, P. 1982. *Form und Grund. Interpretation eines Kapitels der Hegelschen Wissenschaft der Logik*. Bonn: Bouvier.
- Rorty, R. 1989. *Contingency, Irony and Solidarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenkoetter, T. 2017. "The Logical Home of Kant's Table of Functions." In *International Yearbook of German Idealism*, ed. D. Emundts and S. Sedgwick. Berlin: de Gruyter. 29–52.
- Russell, B. 1914. *Our Knowledge of the External World*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Ryle, G. 1979. "Adverbial Verbs and Verbs of Thinking." In *On Thinking*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 17–39.
- Schick, Friedrike. 1994. *Hegels Wissenschaft der Logik—metaphysische Letztbegründung oder Theorie logischer Formen?* Freiburg: Karl Alber.
- . 2002. "Die Urteilslehre." In Koch and Schick 2002, 203–24.
- Sedgwick, S. 2012. *Hegel's Critique of Kant: From Dichotomy to Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sell, A. 2006. "Leben." In Cobben et al. 2006, 301–5.
- Sellars, W. 1958. "Counterfactuals, Dispositions, and Causal Modalities." In *Minnesota*

- Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, vol. 2: *Concepts, Theories, and the Mind-Body Problem*, ed. Herbert Feigl, Michael Scriven, and Grover Maxwell. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 225–308.
- . 1967. “Aristotle’s Metaphysics: An Interpretation.” In *Philosophical Perspectives: History of Philosophy*. Atascadero, CA: Ridgeview.
- Siep, L. 1970. *Hegels Fichtekritik und die Wissenschaftslehre von 1804*. Freiburg: Karl Alber.
- Southgate, H. 2014. “Hegel and the Identity of Indiscernibles.” *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 96, no. 1: 71–103.
- Stekeler-Weithofer, Pirmin. 1992. *Hegels analytische Philosophie: Die Wissenschaft der Logik als kritische Theorie der Bedeutung*. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- Stern, R. 2009. *Hegelian Metaphysics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2017. “Freedom, Norms, and Nature in Hegel: Self-Legislation or Self-Realization.” In Zuckert and Kreines 2017, 88–105.
- Strawson, P. 1959. *Individuals: An Essay in Descriptive Metaphysics*. London: Methuen.
- . 2001. “Truth.” In *Nature of Truth: Classic and Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. M. P. Lynch. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Taylor, C. 1975. *Hegel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1995. “The Importance of Herder.” In *Philosophical Arguments*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Theunissen, M. 1974. “Krise der Macht: Thesen zur Theorie des dialektischen Widerspruchs.” *Hegel-Jahrbuch*, 318–29.
- . 1978. “Begriff und Realität. Aufhebung des metaphysischen Wahrheitsbegriff.” In Horstmann 1978, 324–59.
- . 1980. *Sein und Schein: Die kritische Funktion der Hegelschen Logik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Thompson, Manley. 1953. “On Aristotle’s Square of Opposition.” *Philosophical Review* 62, no. 2: 251–65.
- . 1972. “Singular Terms and Intuitions in Kant’s Epistemology.” *Review of Metaphysics* 26: 314–43.
- Thompson, Michael. 2008. *Life and Action: Elementary Structures of Practice and Practical Thought*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Tiles, M. 2004. “Kant: From General to Transcendental Logic.” In *Handbook of the History of Logic*, ed. D. M. Gabbay and J. Woods. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 85–130.
- Tolley, C. 2006. “Kant on the Nature of Logical Laws.” *Philosophical Topics* 34, nos. 1 and 2: 371–407.
- . 2011. “Kant on the Generality of Logic.” Forthcoming in *Proceedings of the 11th International Kant Congress*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- . Forthcoming. “Hegel’s Development of Kant’s Transcendental Logic.”
- Trendelenberg, F. 1843. *Die logische Frage in Hegels System: Zwei Streitschriften*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Tugendhat, E. 1970. “Das Sein und das Nichts.” In Klostermann 1970, 132–61.
- . 1986. *Self-Consciousness and Self-Determination*. Trans. P. Stern. Cambridge: MIT Press.

- Tuschling, B. 1984. *Probleme der Kritik der reinen Vernunft*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Vieweg, K. 2012. *Das Denken der Freiheit: Hegels Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts*. Munich: Fink.
- Wallace, R. 2005. *Hegel's Philosophy of Reality, Freedom, and God*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wieland, W. 1973. "Bemerkungen zum Anfang von Hegels Logik." In *Wirklichkeit und Reflexion*, ed. H. Fahrenbach. Pfullingen: Neske. 395–411.
- Wiggins, D. 2001. *Sameness and Substance Renewed*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, Mark. 2018. "From the Bending of Beams to the Promise of Free Will." *Physics Avoidance and Other Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wittgenstein, L. 1973. *Philosophical Investigations*. 3rd ed. London: Pearson.
- Wolff, M. 1979. "Über das Verhältnis zwischen logischem und dialektischem Widerspruch." *Hegel-Jahrbuch*, 340–48.
- . 1981. *Der Begriff des Widerspruchs. Eine Studie zur Dialektik Kants und Hegels*. Königstein: Hain.
- . 1984. "Der Begriff des Widerspruchs in der 'Kritik der reinen Vernunft.'" In Tuschling 1984, 178–202.
- . 1986. "Über Hegels Lehre vom Widerspruch." In Henrich 1986, 107–28.
- . 1992. *Das Körper-Seele Problem. Ein Kommentar zu Hegel Enzyklopädie (1830)*, §389 Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann.
- . 1995. "Was ist formale Logik?" In Fricke et al. 1995, 19–31.
- . 2009. *Abhandlungen über die Prinzipien der Logik*. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann.
- . 2013. "The Science of Logic." In DeLaurentis and Edwards 2013, 71–102.
- Wood, A., and S. Hahn. 2012. *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in the Nineteenth Century (1790–1870)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yeomans, C. 2007. "Identity as a Process of Self-Determination in Hegel's Logic." In *Identity and Difference: Studies in Hegel's Logic, Philosophy of Spirit, and Politics*, ed. Philip T. Grier. Albany: SUNY Press. 82–108.
- . 2012. *Freedom and Reflection: Hegel and the Logic of Agency*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zuckert, R. 2007. *Kant on Beauty and Biology: An Interpretation of the Critique of Judgment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zuckert, R., and J. Kreines. 2017. *Hegel on Philosophy in History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

INDEX

- a priori, 5n4
- Absolute, 6, 8n9, 13, 33–37, 45, 49, 60n50, 63n55, 91, 95, 120n45, 135, 170n58, 252, 302n4, 318n25; absolute idea, 253, 254, 271, 277, 281, 300–302, 311, 313, 315–19, 321; as method, 317–22
- action, 12, 143, 147, 226, 249; and self-consciousness, 108, 111
- actuality, 28, 32n54, 33, 37, 48, 54, 62, 92–97; and essence, 218–23, 227–28, 246–49; vs. existence, 86–89, 97n125, 193n8, 247. *See also Wirklichkeit*
- Adorno, 37n60, 255n4
- alienation, 22
- Allison, Henry, 78n91
- Anaxagoras, 13n18
- Anderssein*, 144, 156n22, 168, 172
- animals, 17n26, 104, 106–7, 205, 289
- antiquity, ancient philosophy, 3n1, 13, 24, 77–78, 86n104, 87n105, 248, 266. *See also individual philosophers*
- appearance, 62, 69, 222–29, 234–36, 246, 248. *See also seeming*
- apperception, 101–8, 120n44, 122–25, 133–34, 165–66, 233, 263. *See also unity of apperception*
- Aristotle, 15–16, 35–36, 43, 44n10, 51n28, 54–55, 56n44, 59, 60–63, 70n67, 73, 77, 78n91, 86, 92–95, 97n125, 98nn126–27, 125–26, 128n56, 132n66, 143, 166n52, 185, 199–200, 202–3, 212, 218n2, 219–20, 228, 246–47, 259, 266, 275n4, 296, 300, 305n8, 311n15, 314n20
- art, 22, 27, 86, 224n12, 254
- Badiou, Alain, 26
- beautiful, the, 170n58, 209
- becoming (*Werden*), 178, 192–95, 233, 258, 265; of essence, 211–15, 238
- Befriedigung*, 17n27, 187
- being (*Sein*), 184–215; as concept, 46–53, 62, 176, 191; and essence, 217–50; and negation, 144–45, 171n59; and nonbeing, 141–42, 156n21, 184–86; as presuppositionless beginning, 183–84, 191–92, 230, 233; pure, 192–93, 194n10; reflected character of, 191; vs. seeming, 122, 142; and self-consciousness, 87, 93n115; and thought, 39–60, 184–215, 301–7, 318. *See also Dasein*
- Beisichsein*, 19. *See also freedom*
- Berkeley, George, 53n33
- Bible, 255–56
- Bowman, B., 34n57, 46n14, 98n126, 128n56, 130n64, 156n21, 171n59
- Bradley, 71n73

- Brandom, R., 49n21, 66–69, 71n72, 115–18, 129n61, 161–74, 176–77, 190, 198–99
- Bubner, R., 157
- capital, capitalism, 24n39, 25, 313
- Carnap, Rudolf, 25n41
- Caravaggio, 266n12
- Carroll, Lewis, 111
- categories, categorical structure, 8, 12–14, 31–38, 43, 51, 54n34, 61, 64, 83–84, 105n11, 120–22
- causality, 73n80, 81n95, 112n26, 218n2, 258, 275n4, 283–86, 290–95. *See also* teleology
- Cervantes, 266n12
- chemism, 277–82, 288
- Christianity, 27
- Church, Alonzo, 70
- comprehensibility, norm of, 279–82, 296
- Concept, the, 13, 15n22, 16–17, 19, 29, 31–38, 43, 44–45, 50, 53n32, 55n38, 59, 66, 88, 95, 187, 217, 251–59, 299–315; and conceptuality, 255–56, 277–78; as cognition itself, 277; as thought's self-consciousness, 103, 106, 112–18; as unity of apperception, 73n80
- concepts, 5n4, 9–10, 16–17, 22, 31, 112–18, 257n5; and actuality, 95–97, 120, 219; application of, 207–10, 292–93; and being, 46–53, 62, 176, 187, 191, 303–5; as *ens realissimum*, 97n125; explanation by, 288–89, 295–96; and intuition, 72–85, 88–89, 126–27, 187n2, 193n7, 195, 209, 231, 234; and judgment, 70–71; logical (Brandom), 66–69, 117–18, 173; as moments of conceiving/judgment, 127, 137; movement of, 141, 145–46, 150, 268; and negation, 140, 145–46, 149–50, 151–52, 158–59, 161–74; pure, 12n17, 45–46, 72–73, 79–81, 88n107, 130, 149, 211, 251, 256, 289, 303; relation of to objects, 39–60, 61–62, 82–83, 88, 122, 289; and self-consciousness, 120, 130n62; as the unity of apperception, 121–22, 189
- conceptuality, 145–47, 156n22, 219, 252–58, 277–78, 301, 303, 319–20
- consciousness, 46n13, 237, 238, 304
- content, 9–10, 14, 16, 40, 45, 59–60, 61, 65, 72–76, 109, 116–17, 131, 134, 146, 158–60, 319–20; Brandom on, 163–74; and immediacy, 194–99, 202; “transcendental” (Kant), 80–81, 84
- contradiction, 24n39, 27n44, 42, 44, 61, 91n113, 96, 140, 146, 155–61, 166–67, 178–80, 242, 243–45, 249n45, 307, 310; practical, 268–71
- Copernican revolution, 267
- critique, 4n2, 9, 19, 25n42, 40, 44, 90, 123n49, 128–31, 311
- Crusius, 179
- Dasein*, 51n29, 93n114, 144, 150, 160n32, 186, 193–94, 227–28; translation of term, 193n8
- degrees of reality, 96–97, 98n127, 217
- Denkbestimmung*. *See under* thinking
- Descartes, 7, 20, 35, 36, 41, 58, 115–16, 230n24, 266n12
- dialectic, 90, 178; dialectical negation, 146
- domination, 23, 271,
- Doppelsatz*, 54n37, 87, 309
- Dummett, M., 129–30
- Düsing, K., 134n72
- empiricism, 5, 11–12, 39–40, 110, 116, 261, 305, 319; empirical inquiry, 67–68, 118
- energeia*, 35, 55, 88, 92–95, 126, 143, 228, 246–47
- epistemic conditions, 77–78
- Erdmann, 133n70
- Erscheinung*. *See* appearance
- essence, 17, 38, 87, 96, 122n48, 152, 208, 211–15, 217–50; and actuality, 89, 218–23, 309; and appearance, 202, 206, 218–26, 258, 316; and becoming, 211–15, 238; as character, 210, 224–26, 228, 235–36; essential vs. unessential, 221, 270; and negativity, 145; paradox of, 226–30, 240, 246; problem of, 217–23, 292
- experience, 5, 9, 12, 16, 74–76, 80, 101, 122, 195, 196, 199, 261, 263, 283–84; aesthetic, 209, 291
- explanation, 61, 214–15, 245–46, 274–75, 278–79, 283–85, 293–97, 303; by concept, 288–89, 295–96

- Fichte, 4, 7n7, 9, 20, 74n81, 90, 107–8, 110, 122n48, 127n55, 143, 148, 162n42, 189, 191–95, 219, 232–33, 234n28
- finitude, the finite, 25, 51n29, 96, 119, 126, 155, 166
- Fischer, Kuno, 130n63, 131
- “for itself,” 53–56, 59, 288
- form, formal cause, 217, 220–21, 227–28, 238n30, 259, 266, 303; as law, 222; and matter, 54, 61, 85n103, 92, 202–6, 220, 296
- Franks, P., 169n56
- freedom, 18–31, 33, 34n57, 62n53, 97n125, 136, 179, 252, 271, 308–15, 316n22, 319; and negation, 140, 145–51
- Frege, 4, 16, 32n55, 42, 44, 49n21, 57, 63n56, 65, 69–72, 74, 116n36, 129–33, 135–36, 163n44, 265; “Frege’s point,” 72
- Geist*, 22, 29, 118, 135, 147, 258, 306n9
- George, Leopold, 133n70
- Ginsborg, H., 294nn29–30, 295n32
- givenness, the given, 12, 38, 62, 95–96, 142, 195–99, 201
- God, 6, 9, 64n57, 78n90, 89, 90n112, 124n52, 126, 128, 134n72, 169n56, 269, 278n9, 295n32
- ground (*Grund*), 194, 220, 221, 227–28, 245–50
- Hartmann, E. v., 133n70
- Hartmann, Klaus, 95
- heautonomy, 210, 262, 165, 287
- Hegel, works:
Elements of the Philosophy of Right, 3n2, 4, 54n37, 86, 87, 150n15, 151n17, 154n19, 224n13, 249, 309–14
Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences, 18, 22, 32n54, 39, 55, 87, 135, 142–43, 154, 197, 228n19, 257, 265, 304, 314, 319–22
Glauben und Wissen (Belief and Knowledge), 75, 80n93, 286
Logic, 18, 30n49, 172, 230
Lectures on Fine Art, 170n58, 224n12
Lectures on the History of Philosophy, 15n23, 20, 43, 54, 56n44, 88, 94, 98n126, 127n55, 143n3, 162
Lectures on the Philosophy of World History, 308
Natural Law, 302n4
Phenomenology of Spirit, 4, 24, 34n57, 38, 46n13, 48n19, 49, 50n26, 75, 87, 91n113, 93nn114–15, 95, 98n126, 118, 131–33, 140, 143, 145, 162–74, 176, 193, 195–97, 215, 248, 249n45, 254, 258, 262, 265, 304, 320n28
Philosophy of Nature, 3, 15, 41, 46, 74n81, 83n98, 159n30, 241, 254, 276, 312n16, 314
Philosophy of Spirit, 3, 15, 41, 53n33, 74n81, 147, 196n11, 254, 312n16, 314
Realphilosophie, 3, 29, 30n49, 41, 83n98, 219, 249
- Heidegger, Martin, 25n41, 50n25, 93n114, 185, 185n1, 187n2
- Henrich, Dieter, 105n13, 119–20, 122n47, 131–33, 171n59, 177n69, 234
- Herder, J. G., 205n19
- Herz, Markus, 12n17
- Hobbes, Thomas, 36n59
- Hogemann, F., 308n10, 315n21
- Hölderlin, 144n5
- Horstmann, R.-P., 94n116, 119n41
- Houlgate, Stephen, 58n47, 132n66
- Hume, David, 40, 101n2, 230n24
- Husserl, Edmund, 4, 47
- hylomorphism, 29, 92, 125, 217
- hylozoism, 284
- Ich, nicht-Ich*, 7n7, 9–10, 110, 162n42, 233, 162n42, 233
- Idea, the, 35, 37, 55, 95–96, 242n35, 247, 253, 301–2; absolute, 253, 254, 271, 277, 281, 300–302, 311, 313, 315–19, 321; life as, 254; as method, 317–22; of the true and the good, 38, 271, 306, 307–15
- idealism, 3–18, 77–78, 95, 98n126, 110, 114, 143, 164–65, 253n2, 255n4, 258; of Aristotle, 227n17, 253n2; failure of, 119; in Kant and Hegel, 3–5, 9–16, 31n51, 33–38, 47, 82n97, 83n98, 93n114, 150, 179; vs. positivism, 96; subjective and objective, 10–14, 59, 80, 82n97, 83n98, 200, 247, 259
- identity, 108–9, 231–33, 244; of indiscernibles, 194n10, 239–41

- immediacy, 132n66, 142, 150, 157, 167, 173, 194–99, 201; “indeterminate,” 184; mediated, 197–98, 202–4, 207–9, 225, 234, 238, 258, 261n7
 impositionism, 73n80, 80, 119n41, 125–27, 200, 207, 320
 indifference, 211–15, 234n27, 279–81
 inference, 61, 72, 73n77, 81, 111, 117, 132–33, 163n44, 261, 287–88
 infinite, infinity, 13, 118–25, 130n64; mathematical, 119n42
 intuition, 22, 35, 47, 48, 58n47, 62, 65, 72–85, 88–89, 126–27, 164, 196n11. *See also under concepts*

 Jacobi, F. H., 19–20, 123n50, 130n64, 207
 Jaspers, Karl, 24
 Jesus, 147, 256–58
 judgment, 9, 14, 20, 37–38, 40–42, 44–45, 50–51, 64, 71, 74–76, 78–81, 175, 283–97; aesthetic, 290–91, 293; apperceptive character of, 102–38, 141, 166, 171n59, 187, 189; as commitment, 162, 189; determining vs. reflective, 208–10, 235–36, 290–93, 317; empirical vs. nonempirical, 183; and negation, 141–43; vs. the proposition, 52, 133n68, 183, 218n2; speculative, 154

 Kant, Immanuel, 49n21, 54n34, 88–94, 101–5, 112–31, 142, 143, 147–48, 165, 169n56, 189–90, 193n7, 205–6, 219n4, 231, 233, 241, 243–45, 253, 315n21; on the antinomies, 149–50, 152, 158–59, 161, 178–79, 260n6; and idealism, 3–5, 9–16, 31n51, 33–38, 150, 179; on judgment, 287–97; on logic, 39–47, 51–52, 57–60, 61–65, 69, 72–84, 199–200; on reason, 19–24, 38, 42–43, 88–90, 101, 167n53, 259–64, 266–70; on reflection, 207–10, 233–39; on teleology, 273–76, 283–86
 Kierkegaard, 27
 Kimhi, Irad, 134n73
King Lear, 223–24
 Klopstock, 255–56
 knowing (*Erkennen*), 254–55, 259, 263–64, 303–4, 315–17; practical, 304–15
 knowledge, 4–5, 8–12, 34n57, 37, 40–46, 50, 62, 77–79, 82, 176, 184–90, 245, 286; Aristotle on, 202–3; discursive nature of, 188; empirical, 196–97, 206–7, 209; immediate vs. mediated, 195n11, 198; and self-consciousness, 108–12. *See also knowing*
 Korsgaard, Christine, 112
 Kosman, Aryeh, 63, 255, 258
 Kreines, J., 15n21, 35n58, 273n1, 295nn31–32
 Krug’s pen, 32n54, 87
 Künne, W., 49

 language, 48, 63n55, 296
 law, lawfulness, 170, 177, 211–12, 222, 261, 284, 290–94
 Leibniz, Leibnizian, 16, 35, 36, 41, 134n71, 194n10, 219, 223, 230n25, 239–41, 279n10
 life, 38, 62, 253–54, 273–97, 300–304, 307; and Absolute Idea, 277, 281, 300, 315–17, 320
 likeness / unlikeness, 240–42
 Locke, John, 24, 112, 212, 230n24, 231
 logic: apperceptive, 101–8; as basis for *Realphilosophie*, 3nn1–2; dialectical, 43, 178; formal character of, 14–15, 29n47, 40, 63, 72–73, 83n100; Frege on, 69–72; general, 9, 16, 40–42, 57, 72–84, 101–3, 160–61; Kant on, 39–47, 51–52, 57–60, 61–65, 69, 72–84; logical differences, 175; logical infinity, 118–25; logical movement, 4, 38, 45, 104, 115, 125, 129–37, 151–53, 172, 192; meaning of in Hegel, 69–99; as metaphysics, 37, 4–18, 37, 38, 39–69, 122–25, 128–37, 164, 186–90, 199, 217, 299–300; and negation, 139–80; objective, 43, 128–37, 188, 251, 255; as ontology, 53n32, 58n47, 73n78, 124, 128, 128n56; *Port Royal*, 16, 41, 73n78; practical significance of, 18–31; pre-Hegelian, 41–60; priority of, 7; as “realm of shadows,” 28–29, 39, 249; relation between general and transcendental, 2n53, 64–65, 72–74, 76, 80, 83n98, 84n101, 101, 104, 160, 200, 234, 265; as science of pure thinking, 4–15, 73n78, 40, 45, 83n100, 90n11, 95, 114, 199, 251; *Seinslogik*, 24n39, 34n57, 115; speculative, 148, 178, 322; subjective, 251, 255, 277–83; subjectivity in,

- 4n2, 44; transcendental, 9, 16, 40–41, 43, 44, 57, 58n47, 72, 79, 128, 136; *Wesenslogik*, 24n39, 34n57
- logos, 14, 33, 85, 93, 126, 185n1, 201, 218, 220, 305, 306n9
- Longuenesse, B., 34n57, 40, 102–3, 126, 247–48, 293
- Martin, C., 32n54
- Marx, Karl, 24n39, 25, 28, 96, 98n126, 271
- mathematics, 9, 65, 70n67, 90, 94n117, 119n42, 180, 267
- matter, 212, 283–84; and form, 54, 61, 85n103, 92, 202–6, 220, 296
- mechanism, 62, 274–89, 294n29
- Metaphysical Deduction, 62, 64–65, 88, 89, 122, 153, 169n56, 173, 207, 267
- metaphysics: meaning of, 60–69; and logic, 3n2, 4–18, 37, 38, 39–99, 122–25, 128–37, 164, 186–90, 199, 217, 299–300; special, 124n52, 128; traditional/dogmatic vs. Hegelian, 4n2, 11, 25n42, 35–37, 39–44, 57, 73, 94, 118–19, 124, 145, 244n38, 251
- McDowell, John, 8n, 46–47, 49, 52, 75, 82n97, 83n98, 106, 190n6, 306n9
- McFarlane, J., 73n78
- measure (*Maß*), 186, 211, 214
- mind, 6, 7, 12n17, 15, 78n91, 136, 227n17
- modality, 162, 176–77, 222
- modernity, 21–22, 26–28
- Möglichkeit*, 55
- Moment, das / der*, 203, 205
- Moore, Adrian, 62n53, 65
- moral law, 90, 207, 262
- morality, 150n15, 224n13, 307, 311
- Mure, R. G. R., 91n113, 222, 227nn17–18
- naturalism, 205n19, 306n9, 308n11
- nature, 22, 29, 32n54, 55n41, 59, 88, 97n125, 227n17, 262, 267, 277n7, 284–86, 290–96, 321
- necessity, 98, 101n2, 125, 211–12, 218n1, 252, 259; practical, 264–71; subjective, 273n1, 274, 283–97
- negation, 4, 19, 23, 27, 34n57, 38, 47n18, 59–60, 67, 90n111, 98, 137, 139–80, 195, 229, 230–32, 249n45; autonomous self-negation, 149–51, 158, 233n26; mathematical vs. logical, 244–45
- Neoplatonism, 6, 87, 94
- Newton, Newtonian mechanics, 177–79, 211, 244–45, 267, 279
- Niethammer, 43, 124n51
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, 7n8
- nothing (*Nichts*), 150, 184, 186–88, 190
- nous*, 13, 35, 200, 207, 248, 266, 322n30
- Nuzzo, A., 318n25
- objectivism, 119n41, 306n9
- objectivity, 9, 17, 104, 125, 128–37, 242n35, 252–53, 277–83
- ontological argument, 124n52, 188n4, 278n9
- opposition, real, 175–80, 241, 243–45
- Parmenides, 184–86
- perception, 8, 20, 93, 106–7, 141–42, 190, 196, 320n28; inner, 112
- philosophy, philosophical knowledge, 7–11, 31, 34n57, 40, 48, 60n50, 66–68, 77, 123–24, 223, 297, 311–13; first, 35, 40, 251; history of, 29, 35–37, 129; practical import of, 18–31
- Pinkard, T., 18n28, 160n32, 277n7, 302n4, 314n20
- Plato, Platonism, 7, 35, 36, 55, 86, 94, 96, 97n125, 142, 186, 202, 219, 230n24, 231, 247, 251, 263, 315n21
- Plotinus, 315n21
- Pontius Pilate, 256–58
- possibility, 32n54, 218n1; logical vs. real, 58n47, 62, 79–82, 92, 200
- pragmatism, 7n8
- predicate, predication, 23n36, 31, 45, 55n38, 56, 60, 63–65, 70–71, 76, 114–15, 122n47, 137, 239–40, 254, 266; essential, 154, 211–13, 227, 232; and negation, 139, 146; and the problem of indifference, 211–15; quantitative and qualitative, 144, 186, 211–15, 270, 274, 316
- principle of sufficient reason, 57, 59, 63n54, 218n2, 221, 222, 239–43
- proposition, 44, 49–52, 71–72, 113, 122n47, 133, 134, 137, 190n5,

- psychologism, the psychological, 16, 18n28,
50–51, 69n66, 72n75, 77, 95, 133–37, 163, 167,
219, 259–61, 276
- purpose, purposiveness, 209, 268–71, 273n1,
275n4, 280–81, 283–85, 290, 293, 294nn29–
30; of the world, 305–13, 319; *Zweck* vs.
telos, 308n10. *See also* teleology
- Quine, W. V. O., 7, 87, 186
- rationalism, 9–10, 25n41, 44, 128n56, 183–84,
251, 261
- real, the, 6, 13, 217, 247; as negation, 140
- realism, 6, 47, 74, 97, 97n125, 164, 188n4
- reason, 12–13, 15n22, 35, 42, 61, 68, 101, 130, 135,
140, 200–201, 248, 264–71, 311; historicity
of, 313–15; Kant on, 19–24, 38, 42–43, 88,
101, 167n53, 259–64, 266–70, 287–97; prac-
tical, 90, 111, 207, 210, 260, 295, 305–6, 309–
11; purposive nature of, 38, 262–63, 283–97;
self-authorization of, 20, 52, 148, 299
- reason, sufficient. *See* principle of sufficient
reason
- reasons, reason-giving, 20–21, 26, 30, 112, 113–
14, 142–43, 147
- reconciliation, 302n4, 306–11
- Redding, P., 47n18, 54n34, 63n55, 168, 170
- reflection, 207–10, 221–22, 223–26, 230–39,
239–40, 246, 248, 252, 258; absolute, 235,
239; positing vs. external vs. determining,
14n19, 235–36; reflective judgment, 154,
208–9, 235–36, 260, 268, 290–97
- representation, 28, 49n21, 115–16
- reproduction, 293–94, 301
- right, 86, 224n13, 310–14
- Rödl, S., 83n98, 105, 108–12, 114
- Rome, 150–51
- Romeo and Juliet*, 223n10
- Rorty, Richard, 7n8, 116n36, 176n67
- Rosenkoetter, T., 40–41
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 25
- Russell, Bertrand, 25n41, 71n73
- Ryle, Gilbert, 106
- 171n59, 187n2, 190, 201, 221–22, 223–26,
229, 230n24, 234–35, 240, 306, 309. *See also*
seeming; appearance
- Schelling, 4, 6, 8n9, 13, 108–9, 124, 234n28,
316n22
- Schiller, 25
- Schlegel, 8n9
- Schlosser, J. G., 219n4
- Schmitt, Carl, 26
- Scholastics, Scholasticism, 15–16, 71, 124,
129n60, 219n4
- seeming, 87n105, 95–96, 122, 122n48, 220–22,
227–29. *See also* *Schein*
- Selbstbeziehung*, 151, 160
- self, the, 53, 115, 118–19, 125, 233
- self-consciousness, 6n5, 16, 20, 30n50, 48n19,
52, 53, 57, 59, 66, 91n13, 101–37, 237,
249n45, 304; as absolute idea, 316; as
being, 87, 93n115; and the concept, 112–18,
130n62, 253; and negation, 153; as truth, 53,
56–57, 59, 115, 125, 134, 278
- self-legislation, 90, 148, 207
- self-objectification, 21–22
- Sellars, Wilfrid, 12, 42, 98n127, 162, 198, 201–7,
209, 246
- Shakespeare, 266n12
- skepticism, 19, 34n57, 49n21, 162n39
- slavery, 150–51
- Socrates, 225n15
- soul, 15, 78n91, 91n112, 92, 124n52, 128, 158, 284,
287, 304
- Spinoza, 35, 36, 37n61, 146, 212, 219, 223, 231,
241
- spirit, 6n5, 18–19, 30, 32n54, 33, 44, 303–4, 310,
314; absolute, 89. *See also* *Geist*
- spontaneity, 10, 14n19, 35, 38, 48, 261–64,
266–68
- state, political, 301, 311–12
- Stern, R., 97n125, 306n9
- Strawson, P. F., 25n42, 51n28, 80
- subjectivity, 17, 44, 64, 73n80, 95, 98n127,
107–8, 119n41, 131–32, 135, 141, 143, 146–47,
219, 266n12
- sublation, 141, 145, 150, 210, 238, 301
- substance, 54, 55n38, 56n41, 61, 65, 73, 84, 98,
143, 172n59, 212, 219–20, 229, 252, 216
- Sache*, 85, 101, 157, 160
- Schein*, 25, 76n85, 87n105, 101, 122n48, 164,

- synthesis, 74n82, 79, 80, 85n102, 102, 143–45, 150, 236
- Tathandlung*, 191
- teleology, 254, 269, 274–95
- Theunissen, Michael, 4n2, 17n28, 23, 25, 43n7, 71n71, 96n122, 98n126, 149, 229, 234
- thing in itself, 5–6, 10–11, 58, 77–78, 116n36, 123n50, 129, 152, 179, 206, 245, 248–49, 276
- thinking, thought: and actuality, 88–99; agreement of with itself, 51–52; apperceptive character of, 65, 91, 101–37, 219; and being, 39–60, 184–215, 301–7, 318; discursive character of, 14, 20, 47, 89–91, 185, 207, 265, 269–70; forms of, and forms of objects, 3–99; and negation, 139, 140–43, 148; pure, 4–15, 21, 48, 88, 199, 251, 253n2, 255–71, 316–22; as self-constituting, 33, 108–12; spontaneity of, 10, 48, 76, 79, 105, 148, 200–201, 207, 261; as subject matter of logic, 4–15, 73n78, 40, 45, 83n100, 90n111, 95, 114, 199, 251; thought-determination (*Denkbestimmung*), 7n7, 8, 15, 28–29, 38, 56, 124, 129, 183–84, 247, 251, 264, 315n21; willing as form of, 317
- Thompson, Michael, 274–75
- Tiles, Mary, 42, 104–5,
- time, 82, 88n109, 294n29
- Tolley, 84n101
- transcendental affinity, 122
- transcendental deduction, 64, 69, 82, 84, 120–21, 125, 265
- Trendelenberg, 133n70, 155n20
- Trieb*, 133, 318n25
- truth, 71, 76, 95–96, 176n67, 252–58, 299–305; as self-consciousness, 53, 56–57, 59, 115, 125, 134, 278; speculative, 140, 153–55
- Tugendhat, E., 43n7, 49, 71n71
- understanding (*Verstand*), 16n25, 24–30, 33, 34n57, 72n76, 73n77, 102, 119–20, 126, 169n56, 189, 234n28; as power of conceiving, 121; and reason (*Vernunft*), 27, 166–67, 260–61
- unity of apperception, 73n80, 93n114, 102–5, 115–16, 120–22, 189, 191; analytic vs. synthetic, 105n11, 232–33, 237
- universal, 9, 24–26, 42, 51, 55n41, 56n43, 59, 71n72, 95, 114, 126, 144n5, 208–9, 292–93
- Weinholtz, 133n70
- Wiggins, D., 220n6
- will, 306–7, 309, 314
- Wirklichkeit*, 35, 53n32, 54n37, 55, 62, 88, 94–95, 143, 218n1, 222, 227, 228. *See also* actuality
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 4, 7, 8, 25n41, 63, 163, 190n5
- Wolff, Christian, 16, 41, 42, 53n32, 58n47, 128n56
- Wolff, M., 74n81, 76n87, 124n52, 130n64, 156, 177–80, 242
- Zuckert, R., 294n29